NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXLVII.

FEBRUARY, 1894.

MY AMERICAN EXPERIENCES.

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE SWISS REPUBLIC.

FROM my early boyhood I desired to visit America, not that I wished to seek a new home there, or merely to satisfy my curiosity or my love of travel, for the land and people of the United States always excited an interest in me which had something of the fascinating power of magnetism.

I left the University of Jena on the 13th of November, 1860, and reached New York after a stormy voyage of twenty-one days. The political situation in the United States at that time was comparable with the sultry air which precedes a thunderstorm. In South Carolina the Governor had declared, that in the event of Mr. Lincoln's election the only alternative left was the secession of that State from the federal Union; and if, he said, the Government of the United States, forgetful of the lessons of history, should attempt coercion, it would become the solemn duty of the South to meet force by force.

I remained in New York only a few days, but long enough to receive a lasting impression of the tremendous energy which pulsed in the waving life of the Empire City. I was particularly struck by the discovery which I made there that in the United States the task of the policemen is not to vex their fellow-citizens, but to protect women and children, who were led safely through

Copyright, 1894, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the bustle of wagons by the stately bluecoats. In the old country the police had in those times not yet reached this degree of perfection.

My destination was the Looking-Glass Prairie, near Highland, Madison County, Illinois, where the Swiss colony, of which the brothers Köpfli, of Lucerne, had laid the foundation in the third decade of our century, was situated. Here I hoped to become acquainted with the real life of the American farmer, which fiction had always painted to me in the most friendly and peaceful colors. The country around Highland, called Looking-Glass Prairie, is a fertile plain. The town itself lies upon several hills, one of which is called the "Rigi," a very bold comparison, but one which reflects honor upon the good heart and the patriotic sentiments of the first settlers.

It is said that the mountaineer living in the level country feels unhappy. I passed my youth in Switzerland, and spent three years as a student in Jena, in the midst of the castle-crowned hills of Thuringia; but I never felt more happy and more pleased than during my brief sojourn at Looking-Glass Prairie.

I will not attempt to compare Highland and its surroundings with the lake of Lucerne and its environment, but a man who has seen the Looking-Glass Prairie in a clear moonlight night without having been touched is, in my opinion, incapable of feeling the grand beauty of the Rütli.

My good parents had furnished me with pocket-money far beyond my merit, so that I could have afforded to look upon the farmers' life in easiness. But I preferred to work and took a place with a farmer, whose name was Leder. He had been born in Ober-Flachs, Canton of Aargau. To distinguish him from his two brothers he was called the Little Leder. In his youth, as coachman, he had driven my father to the federal Diet at Lucerne. The Little Leder was therefore proud of his new hand; and although nearly everybody at Highland knew me, he never failed to present me with the words, "Here is Frey, my servant." Twenty years later, when I visited Highland as the first Minister of Switzerland to the United States, Little Leder appeared at one of the dinners offered to me in those joyful days, exclaiming, as I had predicted, "This is Minister Frey, who once was my servant, my *servant*." I, on my part, was not less proud of being a farm-hand, and I think I may say that little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Leder never had a hand who was more exact in the fulfilling of his duty than myself.

Our daily fare consisted of coffee, bacon, and cornbread. The bacon was not of the finest quality, and I had to take some coffee after every morsel, in order to wash it down as fast as possible. It seems that Mrs. Leder remarked this, for one day she told me that henceforth a special piece of bacon would be on the plate for me. But Mrs. Leder had not reckoned with my neighbor, a tall, fine-looking man from the canton of Solothurn, called Ruedi, who, without further ceremony, took the select piece the first time it was provided and put it on his plate. This misfortune, however, did not occur to me again, for the next day I was quicker than Ruedi in laying hold of it, and from that time I enjoyed the uncontested possession of this privilege.

Not very far from Highland there was living, on his farm, Frederick Hecker, the most eminent and popular man of the German Revolution of 1848. He was an accomplished lawyer of great learning, a famous and imaginative speaker, and a man of great, sometimes even rough, openness. There never was a man more unselfish or a more fervent idealist, and never was I more proud of a man's friendship than I was of the paternal affection with which Hecker, who was a friend of my father, honored me. I visited him several times at his farm; and four years later, it was he who cordially received me when I came out of my southern captivity, broken and miserable.

In the mean time the storm had broken out. Abraham Lincoln had hardly ascended the presidential chair when the first gun was fired in the port of Charleston. In vain did Mr. Lincoln assure the people of the South in his inaugural address that they had no cause of apprehension either as to their property or persons from the accession of a Republican administration. In vain he declared that he had no intention to interfere directly or indirectly with slavery in the States where it existed. In vain he declared that he held the Union to be perpetual, a government, and not a mere association, of the States, and that no State of its own mere motion could lawfully go out of the Union. In vain he added: "In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being the aggressors."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The storm broke out. Mr. Lincoln called for volunteers. The people of the North responded cheerfully. One of the first who hastened to offer his service to the country was Frederick Hecker. He entered as a private in the regiment of Franz Sigel, his friend and companion in 1848, and some time afterwards a regiment of volunteers was raised for him and placed under his command. It was the Twenty-fourth Illinois.

I had in the mean time sojourned some days at Quincy, Ill., and on the 17th of June I enlisted in the 24th at Chicago. On the same day I was appointed by Colonel Hecker to be color-bearer of the regiment, and in the evening we left Chicago for Alton, Ill.

Thus I became a soldier; why, is a question not easily answered. I am the descendant of an old family of soldiers, whose blood has been shed on many a battle-field. Mine I had shed hitherto only in duels during my student life. The prospect of fighting in a jolly, merry campaign possessed a great charm for me, and I will not deny that this was one reason which induced me to enter into the regiment of Hecker. But I dare say that I was not less inspired by the idea of supporting the great cause of the republic, of fighting for the preservation of the Union. I was at that time old enough to comprehend that the dismemberment of the United States would seriously injure the cause of liberty in the world and that the idea of republican government would develop itself in a very different way if, instead of the one and indivisible Union, several groups of rival States should be established on the American continent.

Besides this I was, like every well-educated European, a decided abolitionist. However, I was not a mere adventurer, when on June 17, 1861, I received out of Colonel Hecker's hand the colors of the regiment, and well may I add that no native American was prouder than I to bear the Star-Spangled Banner. And never did I change my feeling during all the fatigues and dangers of the war.

And we did not have to wait very long for perils and hardships. First we made war more or less on our own responsibility in the country near Charles City, Mo., against the rebel bushwhackers, who had made their appearance there. Afterwards we served in southern Missouri under the command of Prentiss.

One day we heard that we were assigned to the brigade of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Grant and that he would inspect the regiment. We were placed in line and every preparation for inspection was made, but the general did not appear. I was somewhat astonished when, nevertheless, the colonel commanded, "Present arms!" Two inconspicuous riders, who had remained for some time opposite to the left wing of the regiment, then moved forward towards the colonel. These two horsemen were, as we soon learned, General Grant and his aide-de-camp, a German major named Kraut.

The General wore at that time a long beard without a moustache. We had yet heard little or nothing of the future conqueror of the Confederacy, so that the ceremony, I confess, failed to make a great impression upon us. But subsequently I never neglected to mention the fact that I had belonged to the first brigade which Ulysses S. Grant had commanded.

Soon after this I brought to General Grant two prisoners who had been captured by our regiment. He had taken up his headquarters at Pilot Knob, and was staying in a small, low house surrounded by an orchard. The General came out, himself, to receive my report, and addressed several questions to me. My English in those days was most defective, as I fear it is still, and I am afraid the General learned but little profitable news from me. Nevertheless he dismissed me not unkindly.

During the war I seldom saw General Grant. Our regiment was soon afterwards sent to Kentucky, where we were put under the orders of a leader not less famous, General Sherman. Many years after the war I met General Grant at Washington, where he spent some time as a guest of his friend General Beale. Immediately after his arrival I paid my respects to him, and he was kind enough to return my visit the following day, although my residence was at least three miles from General Beale's house. The former General-in-Chief and President of the United States came to me in a modest carriage. It was soon after his return from his journey around the world. During this voyage, when he arrived at Basel, I had received him, together with the United States Consul, Mr. Erny. But as he did not seem to remember the fact, I did not speak about it.

On the other hand, we conversed about the impressions which the General had received in Europe, especially in Paris. And if I say "we," I must add that it was not I, but the taci-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turn General, who bore almost alone the brunt of the conversation. In clear language he described the political situation of Europe at that time, throwing interesting accidental lights on the leading statesmen, with the greater number of whom he had become acquainted, and whom, as far as I could judge, he described very accurately. Suddenly he paused and exclaimed, "I forget that you are a European, and that you must know all these things better than I."

I often saw the General afterwards in Washington, and he always had a warm handshake and a kind word for me. I desire here to express the most lively feelings of gratitude for the great cordiality and kindness shown to me during my stay at Washington by other eminent generals of the Union, notably Sherman, Sheridan, McClellan, Rosecrans, Schofield, Hunt, and many others.

I have heard many opinions about General Grant, and I suppose it would little interest the readers of this REVIEW to know what I think of him—from a military point of view. But I believe that the impartial historian cannot but render him this justice: that he had in a high degree the capacity of making great resolutions and carrying them out with immovable perseverance in spite of all obstacles. And this is in my eyes the most important quality of a commander-in-chief.

Soon after our arrival in Kentucky, Sherman established his headquarters at Louisville. He was at that time but little known, and many of my old comrades may remember that a great number of people thought him a most extravagant kind of a general. But he very soon found occasion to give proof of his great faculties and to make his name immortal.

Our regiment had for a long time been encamped in Colesburgh, Ky., without occupation. At the end of January or in the beginning of February, 1862, we moved towards Bowling Green, and, after having taken that town, advanced against Nashville. From there we went (we belonged to the division of General Mitchell, called the flying division) in forced marches against Murfreesboro and Decatur, Ala., where we had the chance to take a *tête-de-pont* constructed with cotton bales. The principal object was to gain possession, by the capture of Decatur, of the important system of railroads of which that town was the centre. For this successful campaign, General Mitchell, who was known before the war as a great astronomer and whom

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the boys called "Old Stars," was promoted to the rank of major-general.

On June 17, 1862, I left the Twenty-fourth Illinois Regiment at Athens, Ala., to raise a company for the Second Regiment of Hecker. I had been made second lieutenant on August 29, 1861, and on January 1, 1862, first lieutenant. In August following, in Camp Butler, near Springfield, Ill., I was unanimously elected captain by my new company. This company, which was mainly composed of Swiss, most of whom I had recruited at Highland, Ill., I instructed with the greatest care, and it was soon considered one of the best in the regiment.

In September we were sent to Washington to be incorporated in the Army of the Potomac. Without staying at Washington, we marched over the long bridge into Virginia, where we camped on the Arlington Heights. I shall never forget the sight which presented itself to our eyes the morning after our arrival—as the sun rose above the Capitol and poured its golden splendor over that wonderful building and the city, to the defence of which we had hastened from the far West.

In the battle of Fredericksburg our regiment, the Eighty-second Illinois, had no direct part. In January, 1863, the passage of the Rappahannock was for the second time tried in vain. Then came the battle of Chancellorsville, in which our regiment lost 156 men out of 450 in about half an hour; and then the battle of Gettysburg.

Our regiment was still commanded by Colonel Hecker, who had fought like a lion at Chancellorsville, where he was seriously wounded. Our brevet-commander was Count Schimmelpfening, a brave soldier, who had learned his business in the German army. The division was commanded by Carl Schurz, who, although not a soldier by profession, always distinguished himself, especially so at the unfortunate battle of Chancellorsville, by his perfect coolness.

The 17th of June was destined to be an important day for me. We were already on the march for the Potomac and for Maryland and Pennsylvania. Colonel Hecker and Major Rolshausen had been wounded at Chancellorsville and they had not yet returned to the regiment. Lieutenant-Colonel Salomon, who went out of the war as a brigadier, then commanded the regiment, and on the 17th of June conferred upon me the functions of an acting major. I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

therefore made the campaign of Gettysburg on horseback. I was very happy over this distinction, though it was to prove the cause of my misfortune. On the evening of the first day of the battle of Gettysburg I was taken prisoner with 3,000 others during the retreat through the town, and I am still sure that I could have escaped, had I not thought it my duty and a point of honor to remain on horseback to the last moment. If I had been on foot, it would have been an easy thing for me to get forward with the compact mass of our retiring troops, whilst on horseback I was constantly stopped and finally cut off with seventy-six men of our regiment and taken prisoner.

"Captive" is a terrible word, the significance of which can only be conceived by him who has been in the unfortunate position which it describes. Never, assuredly, had the horrors of war made a more dreadful impression upon our soldiers than on that day. I, for my part, shall never forget the thrilling scenes which presented themselves to us as we were led back over our own fighting-ground, passing by a number of the dead and wounded of our own regiment.

I received a touching proof of the attachment of my soldiers on that evening. My horse having been taken from me as soon as we were made prisoners, I found myself bereft of everything. The men soon knew it, and, without my being able to prevent it, they made a collection among themselves, and in a short time I was provided with blanket, breadbag, and canteen—in short, with everything a man needs in the field.

However, I did not long enjoy the use of these, for, on our arrival at Staunton, after a painful march of seventeen days, the commissioned officers were packed up in a wagon, and, before starting, everything except our clothes was taken from us. Very fortunately I had been able on the journey to sell my field-glass to a Confederate officer.

I shall not try to describe our life in Libby Prison, where we were incarcerated. I know that the present generation of the people of the Southern States refuses to believe the fact that the Northern prisoners were ill-treated and that thousands of our brave boys died of want and hunger. And it would not be a new story for the people of the North to hear. I will therefore confine myself to a few remarks about my personal experiences during those eighteen and a half months which I spent at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Richmond, Salesbury, and Danville, as a prisoner of the Confederate States.

We arrived at Richmond on the 18th of July, 1863. The room beneath ours in Libby Prison was occupied by citizens of Maryland and Pennsylvania, who had been made prisoners by General Lee on his expedition through these States a short time before. Some of us still had a few pieces of hard bread, and, hearing that these citizens endured the most bitter hunger, we threw it to them through the cleft of a trap-door. Never shall I forget the sight of these men, whose appearance bore the stamp of respectability and wealth, rushing with vehemence towards those wretched crumbs. They fought, and snatched them away from each other; and it was painful to watch those who came out victorious in the contest, devouring the bread. After that we had no doubt as to what we had to expect.

Among the Northern officers at Libby Prison we found that those of Colonel Streight's command were the most numerous. Two of them, Captains Sawyer and Flinn, had just been selected as hostages for two Confederate officers who by order of the United States Government were to be executed. Their fate seemed to be inevitable, and I have rarely seen anything so sad as those two officers in their desolate hopelessness. The hair of one of them turned white in a few days. Suddenly a report was circulated that our troops had taken prisoner a son of General Lee, and that a categorical declaration had been sent to Richmond from the United States Government, that the execution of Sawyer and Flinn would be immediately followed by that of young Lee. The lives of Sawyer and Flinn were thus saved and a few months later they were exchanged.

Ten months after my capture the fate which they had escaped seemed in store for me. A Northern court-martial had condemned to death three Confederate officers, Major Armsey, Captain Gordon, and Lieutenant Davis. By order of Jefferson Davis, three of our officers were taken as hostages for the condemned, and the lot fell upon Major Robert Goff, of West Virginia, Lieutenant Manning, of Massachusetts, and myself. The commander of the Libby Prison apprised us of this fact, and declared positively that if Armsey, Gordon, and Davis should be hanged, no earthly power would save us from the same fate. Without further notice we were transferred to the cellar, and there confined to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a dark cell, nine feet long by six and a half feet wide. This happened on May 3d, 1864. I was then twenty-five and a half years of age, the oldest of the three.

We had hitherto suffered almost unbearable hunger, but there now began, besides the agony of confinement, real starvation. Our daily ration, which we received every day about noon, consisted of a little piece of cornbread, a morsel of rancid bacon, and six or seven spoonfuls of niggerbeans or rice of the meanest quality. By strict order of the government, the total ration was not to exceed the weight of three-quarters of a pound and two ounces. Very fortunately, there were a number of rats in the cellar, and they paid us a visit the first night of our confinement. Friend Manning, who was a clever and imaginative man, proposed to hunt these horrid animals, which, especially at night, used to fight most fiercely. He constructed a trap, and we used our half-rotten bacon as bait. The rat having been caught, it was my business to raise the cover until it showed its head, when the major had to set to work and to belabor its head with a log until it was dead. Next morning the rats were cooked by the negro who had to clean our cell, and then we ate them. It required a dreadful hunger to conquer the disgust we had for these beasts.

On May 21 a waiter told us that we should probably not be hanged. No other notice was given to us. The fact that President Lincoln had suspended the execution of the three Confederate officers, and that by order of the Department of War three Confederate officers had been taken as hostages for us and had been placed in confinement, Captain Wm. G. Stewart being selected a hostage for me, was concealed from us.

The cell next to ours was soon filled with other hostages, among them being Lieutenants Markbreit and Pavey. Hence sprung up between us a friendship as lively as our increasing weakness would permit. We told stories of home, sweet home, and, the same tales being related over and over again, we finally decided that it should be forbidden to repeat the same thing more than ten times. In accordance with this resolution many a tale was stopped in the telling, although the narrator would affirm solemnly that he was only telling his story for the second time. After a short time we were no longer able to walk, and looked like skeletons. I had to spend some days at the hospital, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was horrified, on coming back, by the appearance of my companions. One day we received our daily ration at four o'clock P. M., instead of at noon, and we had then become so weak through the delay that we could not eat anything that day.

On the 18th day of July we were transferred by railroad to the military penitentiary at Salisbury, N. C., together with some negro soldiers, the doctor having declared that a longer stay in the cell, a description of which I will spare my readers, would undoubtedly kill us. In the penitentiary of Salesbury we were confined together with a band of criminals, and were in constant danger of our lives, until, after the arrival of a further party of our prisoners, we were in the majority. A plan for a general outbreak having been betrayed, the officers were all transported to Danville, and then back to Richmond.

On the 14th of January, 1865, I was exchanged against Captain Gordon. I owed my liberty to the efforts of friends, but above all to the successful intervention of the celebrated American dentist, Dr. Thomas Evans, the same who five years afterwards saved the life of the Empress Eugénie, on the 4th of September, 1870.

I saw Captain Gordon for the first time the 15th of September, 1882, on my arrival in Washington as Swiss Minister. A few weeks ago a Washington paper contained a notice of the captain's death. The article, decorated with our portraits, was inscribed, "A pair for life."

In the winter of 1883 I met Goff and Markbreit at a reception given by Senator Chandler, then Secretary of the Navy. Goff had in the mean time been Secretary of the Navy under President Hayes, and Markbreit had represented the United States as a minister resident in a South American republic.

We did not think of that in our cell.

EMIL FREY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOUTH CAROLINA LIQUOR LAW.

BY THE HON. B. R. TILLMAN, GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

To THE student of social science and government a brief history of what is known as the Dispensary Law, under which all liquors containing alcohol are "dispensed" or sold by State officers, must prove interesting. The prohibition sentiment is very strong in South Carolina, and has been growing stronger year by year. At the Democratic primaries held in August, 1892. the question of "prohibition" or "no prohibition" was voted on, though it was not made an issue—the abstract proposition being merely submitted. "Prohibition" received 38,890 votes, "no prohibition" received 29,464 votes, while 20,008 voters did not feel enough interest to cast a ballot either way.

When the General Assembly met in November following, many members felt that they were instructed to vote for a prohibition law, and a committee of leading prohibitionists drafted a most stringent bill, embodying the most approved features of the Maine, Iowa, and Kansas liquor laws, with some original provisions of their own. This was amended by the prohibitionists themselves under the light of discussion—loosening the screws in places and tightening them in others. It finally passed the House by a good majority. It reached the Senate a week before the time fixed for adjournment, and that body was in a quandary. Prohibition in theory is beautiful. Many towns and a few counties in South Carolina had tried it, however, and the majority of the Senate was sceptical as to its practical enforcement. The Governor, in his message, had pointed out the difficulties and failures along that line, and mentioned the Dispensary system then and now in operation at Athens, Ga., as worthy of careful study in dealing with the liquor problem. After three days of anxious consultation and discussion, the Dispensary bill was introduced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the Hon. J. G. Evans, of Aiken, as a substitute for the bill passed by the House. With a few amendments, it was rushed through and sent to the House on the last night of the session; not without a desperate fight on the part of the advocates of license, however, and an all-night session to force the second reading. The House had no time to examine or alter the bill. It was accepted and amended in title to suit its new purpose, becoming an "Act to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage within this State, except as herein provided."

The Dispensary Act as it became a law was the "prohibition bill" almost in its entirety, only such changes being made as were required by the change of purpose. In the original the dispensers were allowed to sell liquor only for "sacramental, medicinal, and mechanical uses." In the substitute the buyer is required to give no reason for buying or to say to what use it is to be put. He is simply required to sign a written request for liquor, stating his age, residence, and the quantity and kind of liquor wanted, to pay the cost, take the sealed package, and depart. Under the original bill the dispenser furnished his own capital to run the business. In the substitute the State furnishes all capital, and owns all liquors until sold to the consumer. It is curious to note the evolution of the Dispensary idea. All the safeguards and schemes, to convict and punish the illicit seller of liquor, which the ingenuity and study of the prohibitionists everywhere had advised during forty years are embodied in the law. But instead of being there to prevent its sale as a beverage, they are there to prevent the sale by any except the State's officers. The prohibition idea attempts to amend the morals and habits of the people by legislative enactment, and says, "Thou shalt not drink intoxicants as a beverage." The Dispensary looks to the same result—the restraint of the evil—but in a different way. Its advocates argue:

"Men cannot be controlled as to their personal appetites and passions from without. Self-control can alone be relied on in such cases. All human beings of both sexes feel the need of and at times indulge in stimulants of some kind when they can get them—whiskey, wine, beer, tea, coffee, tobacco, absinthe, chloral, opium, quinine, or some other of the long list which it is useless to enumerate here. Nearly all these are harmless used in moderation. Most of them are beneficial under certain conditions; none are absolute curses except when abused. Let us deal with men as they are and try to restrain them in the *abuse* of alcoholic drinks,—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not attempt the impossible by endeavoring to prevent their *using* liquors at all."

And how has the experiment succeeded? The Dispensary Law has been and still is the one absorbing, never-ending topic of discussion, and it has produced some comical alignments and alliances in the efforts to obstruct and defeat it. Newspapers which have always fought prohibition, and those known as the organs of the whiskey ring, have suddenly become strong advocates of prohibition. Prohibitionists who are so radical in their views that the uncharitable call them "cranks" have been found shoulder to shoulder with barkeepers and whiskey dealers in opposing it; and while many eminent divines have lent it their aid and indorsement, others are bitter in its denunciation. The more moderate prohibitionists are delighted with it. The whiskey men are more bitter in their opposition to it than they have ever been toward prohibition.

The law went into effect on July 1, and on the night of the 30th of June every bar in the State closed its doors. The work of preparation, organization, and arrangements for the control of so mammoth a business had been going on for several months. It is safe to say that no member of the General Assembly, and very few others—certainly not myself—ever conceived the magnitude of the undertaking; and yet, after it has been in operation four months, the ramifications, complications, and ultimate growth of the business are still subjects of conjecture and wonder.

All of the legal whiskey traffic has been turned into one channel, flowing to Columbia, the central distributing depot. Agricultural Hall, a large two-story building with a cellar, thus making three stories, 167 feet by 35 feet, had been turned into a bottling-works. It is only a question of time when the erection of much larger quarters on the railroad will be necessary. Fifty-four employees, working ten hours every day, are kept busy bottling, and we find it almost impossible to keep the local dispensaries in stock, and that, too, when I think it safe to say that not more than one-half of the liquor being drunk in the State at this time has passed through the Dispensary. Large quantities were purchased in advance, or in anticipation of the law going into effect, by consumers, while there is hardly a train entering the State, day or night, passenger or freight, which does not haul contraband liquor. Some of the railroads are yielding a measure

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of obedience to the law, but most of them openly defy it or lend their assistance to smuggling liquor into the State.

I have had prepared tables covering the operations of the State Dispensary and of the County Dispensaries up to the 31st of October, the end of our fiscal year. A careful examination of these figures will show that the Dispensary has been more than self-sustaining. The gross sales to consumers for the first four months, under all the difficulties and obstacles, have been $166,643; expenses of State Dispensary, $72,566; expenses of the county dispensaries, $20,054; net profit of State Dispensary, $32,-198; of the Counties', $20,295. The cheapest grade of whiskey is sold at $3.00 per gallon in any quantity from four gallons down to a half-pint. During the month of July twenty-nine Dispensaries were running; in August, thirty-nine; in September, forty-seven; in October, fifty-one. One has been discontinued, leaving fifty now in operation. The number of clerks to Dispensers and assistants is twenty-four. The salaries of these local officers have been fixed by the State Board, and range from $1,000 to $300 per annum. Where the magnitude of the business requires it, the Dispenser is given one or more assistants, but in no case is the salary more than $1,000.

Hitherto under the license system the several counties have derived a revenue of $100 for each license, aggregating last year for the entire State $81,100. Of this, four counties—Charleston, Beaufort, Berkeley, and Colleton—received $57,200, leaving $23,900 for the other thirty-one counties. The State received nothing. In the cities and towns the licenses varied, but the aggregate of all towns in the State for last year was $134,372. It is impossible to do more as yet than give an approximation as to what revenue the State, counties, and towns will derive from the change in the method of controlling the liquor traffic. It is safe to say, however, that if the towns cease their unreasonable and senseless opposition, and three-fourths of the liquor which under any conditions will be consumed in that State shall pass through the Dispensary, the revenue of the towns will not be decreased from what it was formerly, that the counties will receive as much, and the State will obtain a revenue equal at least to both of these.*

* NOTE.—The State gets one-half the profits; the county one-fourth, and the municipality one-fourth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But, although that revenue is not to be despised, the law does not rest on a revenue basis, was not enacted for that purpose, and cannot be defended on that ground. It rests wholly on its claim to being the best method of controlling the evils which are inherent and inseparable from the intemperate use of liquors, and must stand or fall on its merits as compared with other methods of controlling the evil. When the law first went into effect, outside of the city of Charleston there was almost a total cessation of the illicit sale; but, as time wore on, the men who have always dealt in liquors and grown rich thereby became more and more emboldened to disobey the law, mainly by the encouragement given them by the leading daily newspapers, which promised them immunity from punishment by juries, and presented the spectacle of the teachers of the people inculcating disobedience to law.

While the figures in the following table may be misleading, and will doubtless be modified by later statistics, showing the relative amount of drunkenness in like periods before and since the law went into effect, the table has been prepared to give such *data* as could be obtained. It is made up of the official responses by the mayors and intendants of the cities and towns to a circular asking for information. It may be as well to remark, in passing, that the principal opposition to the law is among the citizens of town and cities, and many of them are unwilling witnesses. This is shown by the fact that, out of seventy-five circulars sent to all the principal cities and towns, responses were received from only thirty-three.

The United States Government considers liquor a legitimate and proper source of revenue, and it derives therefrom about $100,000,000 annually. It will not be denied by any advocate of temperance or prohibition that it is a proper subject of taxation; and if it were proposed to remove the tax, which would inevitably reduce the cost to consumers at least three-fourths, there would be a universal howl by these two classes of citizens. The State, in the exercise of its police power for the ostensible preservation of the public health and morals, has, time out of mind, required a license, and the towns and cities in turn required license; and while it is true that the State derived no revenue, and sought only to restrict the traffic within the limits of such municipalities as saw fit to grant licenses, it cannot be denied that the raising of revenue to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPORT FROM TOWNS AND CITIES, OF ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS AND DISORDER ARISING FROM LIQUOR DRINKING FOR A LIKE PERIOD BEFORE AND SINCE THE DISPENSARY LAW WENT INTO EFFECT.

	1892.		1893.	
	July 1 to Sept. 30.	September.	July 1 to Sept. 30.	September.
Lancaster	15	6	2	.....
McCormick*	16	4	.....	.....
Sumter	21	14	7	4
Columbia	50	14	47	21
Union*	2	1	4	1
Camden	17	10	15	14
Greenville	166	76	84	23
Easley*	7	4	1	1
Winnsboro	.....	.....	.....	.....
Beaufort	43	8	43	12
Laurens	17	3	3	2
Johnston*	6	.....	3	.....
Chester	14	14	28	10
Charleston	158	60	70	27
Orangeburg	22	10	14	7
Spartanburg	10	4	2	4
Summerville	3	2	.....	.....
Fort Motte	.....	1	.....	.....
	576	230	283	126

Seventeen towns; thirty-three reported, but eleven had no arrests in either year.
* No dispensary in these towns.

support municipal governments has been the main factor in causing licenses to be issued by the towns. It is far-fetched, unreasonable, then—hypocritical, in fact—to pretend that any disgrace can attach to the revenue feature. The men who are now most loud-mouthed in this pharisaical denunciation are the strongest advocates of the license system, and have had their municipal taxes reduced thereby. On the contrary, if it can be shown that under the Dispensary system there will be a reduction in the consumption of liquor, and a necessary reduction in crime and misery resulting from it, it must follow that the Dispensary, without regard to the revenue feature, is a long stride forward and an improvement on the license system. I will not pretend to say that it is as good as prohibition would be, but I do say that prohibition, here or anywhere else, is impossible, and the only question is how best to regulate the traffic so as to minimize the inevitable injury to society inseparable from the sale of liquor under any circumstances. The claims of the Dispensary to support, and its superiority over any form of licensing, rest on the following grounds:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1st. The element of personal profit is destroyed, thereby removing the incentive to increase the sales.

2d. A pure article is guaranteed, as it is subject to chemical analysis.

3d. The consumer obtains honest measure of standard strength.

4th. Treating is stopped, as the bottles are not opened on the premises.

5th. It is sold only in the daytime; this under a regulation of the Board, and not under the law.

6th. The concomitants of ice, sugar, lemons, etc., being removed, there is not the same inclination to drink remaining, and the closing of the saloons, especially at night, and the prohibition of its sale by the drink, destroy the enticements and seductions which have caused so many men and boys to be led astray and enter on the downward course.

7th. It is sold only for cash, and there is no longer "chalking up" for daily drinks against pay-day. The workingman buys his bottle of whiskey Saturday night and carries the rest of his wages home.

8th. Gambling-dens, poolrooms, and lewd houses, which have hitherto been run almost invariably in connection with the saloons, which were thus a stimulus to vice, separated from the sale of liquor, have had their patronage reduced to a minimum, and there must necessarily follow a decrease of crime.

9th. The local whiskey rings, which have been the curse of every municipality in the State, and have always controlled municipal elections, have been torn up root and branch, and the influence of the barkeeper as a political manipulator is absolutely destroyed. The police, removed from the control of these debauching elements, will enforce the law against evil-doing with more vigor, and a higher tone and greater purity in all governmental affairs must result.

To return to the question of revenue, there will be a maximum of benefit from the operation of the law from the standpoint of these advantages in proportion as there shall be a large revenue. In other words, the restrictions thrown around the consumption and use of liquor by the Dispensary law, and the benefits to arise therefrom, will be in proportion as the liquor consumed is purchased at the Dispensary rather than obtained from illicit sources. Some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fanatical, unreasonable people cry aloud against the iniquity of a government sharing in the "blood-money," as they term it, the tears of women and children, whose fathers, husbands, or brothers are addicted to the use of whiskey. It has already been shown that any system of license which leaves the element of personal profit untrammelled leaves this class of consumers utterly at the mercy of the owners of those dens of vice, the saloons. Men who are compelled to go in the daylight and get what liquor they want from a government officer, and then go elsewhere to consume it, will be likely to go home and be within the restraining influence of that charmed circle.

It is urged that if the State control the traffic, it should sell only at such profit as will cover expenses, and no more. Is it not clear that if the price be fixed at that ratio it will act as a premium on consumption by reason of the fact that a dollar will buy more whiskey that it does now? On the other hand, an equally impracticable scheme is to put the price very high, and make the money that is spent on liquor go only a little way. It will be found here that, as in most things in life, "the middle way is the best." If the price is too high it puts a premium on the establishment of "blind tigers," on smuggling, on the illicit sale in every way; and, while the amount consumed will not be appreciably less, the indirect benefits to society arising from the revenue and by the destruction of all competition with the State are lost. Under the scale of prices, fixed by the State Board, on whiskey now sold in South Carolina there is a handsome profit, while at the same time the liquor at retail is cheaper than it was when sold across the bar. Making allowances for the watering or other adulteration of the whiskey that was formerly consumed, a half-pint bottle of Dispensary whiskey that now costs twenty cents, and containing five average drinks, of far superior strength, would have cost fifty cents at least from a saloon. The profit on the half-pint goes to the reduction of the general tax, and the thirty cents saved to the consumer goes into his pocket for the support of his family.

It is thus seen that whiskey at retail is cheaper than when it was bought from the saloons, while at wholesale or by the gallon it is considerably higher; but the profit in its illicit sale not being very great in wholesale quantities, it is not likely that, after the law has been amended in the way experience has shown to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessary, there will be much competition with the Dispensary in wholesale quantities, by which I mean one or more gallons. It is the retailer with whom we have to deal; and he thrives on political opposition and where there is no Dispensary. When swift and sure punishment shall be meted out to those who break the law, and when public opinion shall have been educated so that the violent opposition now existing shall gradually disappear, there will be small competition with the Dispensaries in the counties where they are located.

The opponents of the law embrace three classes: *first*, citizens of towns whose municipal taxes are increased by the loss of the money formerly derived from licenses; *second*, the liquor dealers and their friends; *third*, the men and their followers who were turned out of power when the present State officers of South Carolina were elected. These last constitute at least two-thirds of those fighting it, and their opposition is purely political. It may not be improper to add that the Judge of the United States District Court has decided that the word "arrival" in the Wilson law of 1890 means "reaching the point of destination and delivery," * and although we have appealed the case to the United States Supreme Court, remembering the decision in the "original package" case, it is likely that Congress will have to be asked to declare that liquor "arrives" in a State as soon as it crosses its borders.

The life of the law—its very backbone—is the State constabulary, officers appointed by the Governor and under his control alone, charged specially with its enforcement. Experience shows that elective officers are almost useless in this matter. They will not offend the electors and jeopardize their chances for re-election. In the light of the experience gained by six months' trial, the law has shown need of amendment in many particulars. The General Assembly, which has just adjourned, has incorporated these in a new statute: "To declare the law in reference to and further regulate the use, sale, consumption, transportation, and disposition of alcoholic liquors or liquids within the State of South Carolina

* Wilson Act, Sup., R. S. U. S., 779.
Be it enacted, etc., That all fermented, distilled, or other intoxicating liquors or liquids transported into any State or Territory or remaining therein for use, consumption, sale or storage therein, shall upon arrival in such State or Territory be subject to the operation and effect of the laws of such State or Territory enacted in the exercise of its police powers, to the same extent and in the same manner as though such liquids or liquors had been produced in such State or Territory, and shall not be exempt therefrom by reason of being introduced therein in original packages or otherwise.—Aug. 8, 1890.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to police the same." The student of jurisprudence will be struck with the changes which the Dispensary Act has undergone in the new law. When men are in earnest in trying to attain an object, no great amount of time is necessary to accomplish a great deal. It remains to be seen what progress has been made, but those best informed on the subject think the new law as great a stride towards perfecting the system as the old was an improvement on prohibition as tried in Iowa and Kansas.

The readers of the metropolitan and other newspapers have been edified for months by the squibs and sneers about "South Carolina's barkeeping Governor." He takes pleasure in assuring the lovers of temperance throughout the land that the dispensary system is a grand success, as compared to the saloon from any standpoint of the license system; and that three-fourths of his fellow-citizens are so much pleased with it that it is safe to prophesy that never again will a barkeeper in South Carolina sell liquor by the drink under license from the State; and before the next General Assembly meets, the illicit traffic in liquor will almost cease. If the Supreme Court does not sustain the District Judge's construction of the Wilson law, it will be confined almost entirely to the "moonshiners" of our mountains. One of the best informed liquor-dealers in the State estimated our consumption under the old system at upwards of a million gallons per annum. There were six hundred saloons and four hundred druggists engaged in its sale in 1892; but under no circumstances will the number of Dispensaries ever exceed one hundred and twenty-five, and it is safe to say that the consumption will be reduced forty or fifty per cent.

B. R. TILLMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE INCOME TAX IN ENGLAND.

BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, BART., M. P.

THE origin of taxes in Britain is shrouded in mystery. We had a coinage in Kent at least a century before the advent of the Romans, so that there was probably some rude system of taxation, though no doubt the chiefs lived for a great part on the produce of their own lands. Under the Romans, taxes appear to have been levied in kind, usually a tenth of the produce. The cattle were taxed at so much a head, and there was also a poll-tax on individuals, the human beings.*

Under the Saxons, the king received, in each shire, a contribution from the produce of the public or folk land, and this, with certain fines, was, during peace, sufficient for the maintenance of the Court. Additional taxes were imposed from time to time by the "Witenagemot," the shire forming the unit of rating, and being assessed according to the number of hundreds it contained.

Under the Normans no new form of taxation was at first imposed. The king continued to derive his revenue mainly from the demesne, which was originally of vast extent and amply sufficient for all ordinary purposes, amounting, according to Domesday Book, to no less than 1,400 manors or lordships, besides farms and lands in Middlesex, Shropshire, and Rutland. In addition to this revenue, the Crown had certain rights; for instance, Purveyance, the right to impress carriages and horses for removals; pre-emption, the right to purchase provisions, etc., at a fixed price; and prisage, the right to take one or two casks, according to the amount of the cargo, from every vessel arriving at port.

* See Dowell's *History of Taxation.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The rights and fines accruing to the Crown under the feudal system also brought in a considerable revenue. The danegeld, or land tax, first imposed in 991, on the advice of Archbishop Sijeric, as an exceptional mode of raising a sum to bribe away the Danes, was reimposed by William the Conqueror in 1084, in consequence of an apprehended attack by Sweyn, at the rate of seventy-two pence for every hyde of land, and was subsequently continued at varying rates as a regular source of income. Scutage, or shield-money, was a sum levied by Henry, in lieu of military service, at the rate of £1 6s. 8d. on the fee of £20 annual value.

In 1194 a tax resembling the danegeld was levied on the carucate, or plough land, a "carucate" being the amount which could be ploughed by one "caruca," or plough, in a season. It was first levied at 2s. the carucate, and subsequently at different rates.

The cities and towns did not pay danegeld, but were assessed for an "auxilium," or aid, which was at first irregularly charged; but after the danegeld was discontinued, in 1163, it was placed on a more regular footing, and charged on all tenants, rural and suburban alike, and termed a "tallage."

Henry II. introduced an additional form of general tax, in which the other forms of general taxation were merged. This affected all movable property, and was first introduced on the occasion of the Saladin tithe in 1133. The contributories were required to pay so much in the pound on the value of their property, and were compelled to take an oath that they had made a correct return. The ordinance imposing the tax was made at Le Mans, after Henry had taken the cross. It provided that

> "Every one shall give the tenth of his rent and moveables. Except, in the case of knights, their arms, horses, and clothing; and in the case of the clergy, their horses, books, and clothing and vestments, and church furniture of every sort; and except the jewels of clergy and laity."

By subsequent provision the clergy and knights who had taken the cross were exempted.

This method of taxation by fractional parts of movables continued for about a century and a half. "Tallages" also fell into disuse after the reign of Edward III.

The origin of customs duties is unknown, and during the Norman kings the trade of England was so small that the revenue derived from them was insignificant. Gradually, however, they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

became more important, and attempts were made to raise the rates. These were resisted as being in contravention of Magna Charta, but eventually they received legal sanction in the Statute of the Staple in 1353.

In 1377 a "tax unheard of before," was imposed by Parliament, which took the form of a poll-tax graduated chiefly according to rank, though partly according to property. Dukes* had to pay £6 13s. 4d.; earls, £4; barons, £2; knights, £1; squires, 6s. 8d., or, if they had no land, 3s. 4d. Beggars were exempt. The Lord Mayor of London was rated as an earl, aldermen of London and mayors of other towns as barons. Yet the whole amount collected was under £25,000! The poll-tax having failed, the country reverted to the previous system of granting fifteenths and tenths.

The first indication of an income tax occurs in 1435, when an act was passed imposing a tax on every person "seized of manors, lands, tenements, rents, annuities, offices, or any other possessions."

But although we have here the idea of income tax, yet this mode of raising a revenue is generally considered to have been introduced by Pitt, in 1799. The rate was 10 per cent., and it produced about £6,000,000. After the peace of Amiens, Addington repealed it on the ground that it ought to be exclusively reserved for times of war, but reimposed it, for the same reason, when the war broke out again in the following year. It was very unpopular and was repealed in 1806, as soon as possible after the close of the great war.

The tax was reimposed by Peel in 1842 for four years, his object being "to relieve trade and commerce from the trammels by which they were hampered and bound" by repealing other taxes in his opinion more injurious. We were, however, over and over again promised that it should be only temporary, and it is still only imposed from year to year.

It was and still is divided into five branches or schedules. The first, or Schedule A, touches income from land and houses, based on the rent. The second schedule (B) is that which deals with rent, but while the measure of charge is one-half in England, it is only one-third in Scotland and Ireland. If the profit proves to be more, the Crown has no right to a surcharge; but if they are less, the farmer may claim a rebate. The difficulty, how-

* See M. S. Buxton's *Finance and Politics.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever, of establishing this is so great that the privilege is of no great value. Schedule C deals with income from any public revenue, imperial, colonial, or foreign. Schedule D refers to incomes from professions, trades, and any income not included otherwise. It is subdivided into:

1. Profits from trade, manufactures, and commerce.
2. Profits from mines.
3. Profits from ironworks.
4. Profits from railways.
5. Profits from canals.
6. Profits from gasworks.
7. Profits from quarries.
8. Other profits.

Profits from trade, manufactures, and commerce, professions and occupations are charged upon the average of the last three years. Schedule E has reference to persons in the employment of the state or in other public employments of profit. Lastly it must be mentioned that there are some important exemptions, as, for instance, small incomes, charities, etc., and various abatements.

The tax is deducted by banks and companies before the dividends are paid, and, so far as individuals are concerned, is due *en bloc* on the 1st of January.

It may be interesting to compare the amounts assessed under each head with those of ten years ago.

	1882.	1892.
Schedule A	190,500,000	201,000,000
" B	68,800,000	58,000,000
" C	39,900,000	39,700,000
" D	267,000,000	362,000,000
" E	34,700,000	49,500,000
Schedule total	600,900,000	710,200,000

Schedule B shows how severely agriculture has suffered, and the same tale is told if we divide Schedule A into land and houses:

	1882.	1892.
Land	68,800,000	57,400,000
Houses	121,000,000	143,000,000

On the other hand, notwithstanding many difficulties, under our Free Trade system, our commerce continues to flourish.

The amount produced by the tax, which then stood at six shillings in the pound, was £13,800,000. The income tax can only be defended on principle as long as it is kept within very moderate limits. It is open to two great objections: Firstly, be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause it falls equally on temporary and permanent incomes; and secondly, because the same rate is imposed on income derived from individual exertion as on that from real property. Various suggestions have been made with the view of rendering the tax more fair. The late Lord Addington attempted to do this by a number of allowances; for instance, 8¼ per cent. from land, 15 per cent. from houses, 33 per cent. from industrial incomes, 20 per cent. from metals, 10 per cent. from earthy minerals, etc. Yet even these numerous and varied adjustments would not meet the abstract justice of the case. Take, for instance, that of houses: 15 per cent. may be a fair allowance for repairs, insurance, etc., on houses as a class, but in parts of the country where building materials are of great durability the repairs may amount to no more than 5 per cent., while in others they reach to 20 per cent. It is no consolation to the houseowner who has an allowance of 15 per cent. for outgoings which amount to 20 per cent., that another houseowner, whose repairs are only 5 per cent., has the same allowance of 15 per cent. Moreover, so far as the above mentioned suggestions are concerned, they leave untouched the great differences between different life tenancies, especially those arising from age. Even in Schedule D, there are the greatest differences between different industrial incomes. Dr. Farr, indeed, who advocated such a course as equitable, added that he should not make any "allowance in large concerns, such as the great breweries, any more than I would with the Bank of England, because I should regard the businesses with a large good-will as nearly equivalent to houses or perpetuities." But who is to say when large breweries end and small ones begin? How can you tax one bank, and not another? Every one knows perfectly well that some kinds of business are much safer than others, and that this is the case even in the same trade; yet to apply this practically would be utterly impossible.

Any system involving a general remission to all incomes derived from trades and professions would grant the same boon to the sleeping partner in a great firm as to a hard-worked country doctor, whose income is dependent on his health, and must therefore be more or less precarious. And yet no mode of dealing with the income tax which leaves these inequalities uncompensated can be defended on the ground of abstract justice. The truth is that the inequalities within each class are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as great as those between the different classes. No changes, therefore, which merely deal with the relative rates of tax, or of allowances, can render the income tax equal in its incidence or just in itself.

I now pass from those who would deal with the different schedules to those who propose to consider the income-tax payers as individuals. To do this effectively would require the most inquisitorial proceedings; it would be very expensive; a host of commissioners must be appointed, armed with full powers to inquire into every man's circumstances, his age, health, etc., etc. Moreover, we are met at once by the fundamental consideration that any such course involves practically, not the amendment, but the abandonment, of the income tax. Mr. John Stuart Mill, for instance, would exempt savings. He said:

"I would tax the income; what I would exempt would be the investment itself. I would not tax the investment, and then the income derived from it: in fact, I would make the tax a tax upon expenditure, and not upon income."

Here we have the plain admission that this is no question of amending the income tax, but of replacing it by one of expenditure; as to which I will only remark in passing that, while in principle there is much to be said in favor of encouraging economy, it must be remembered that already a great portion of our present taxation—the customs and excise duties, as well as the assessed taxes—are taxes on expenditure; and one recommendation of the income tax is that it introduces variety into our system. Moreover, Mr. Mill himself admitted, in answer to a question from Sir C. Wood, that it is impossible practically to exempt actual savings; all you can do is to make an allowance for what you consider that people ought to save—unfortunately a a very different thing.

These and other suggestions were carefully considered in 1861 by a strong committee of the House of Commons, who reported that they felt

"so strongly the dangers and ill-consequences to be apprehended from an attempt to unsettle the present basis of the tax, without a clear perception of the mode in which it is to be reconstructed, that they are not prepared to offer any suggestions for its amendment."

They added that they were

"brought to the conclusion that the objections urged against it (the tax)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are objections to its nature and essence rather than to the particular shape which has been given to it."

Mr. Gladstone has stated that in his opinion, though the tax was "an engine of gigantic power for great national purposes," there are "circumstances attending its operation which make it difficult, perhaps impossible, or at any rate not desirable to maintain it as a portion of the permanent and ordinary finance."

Going through each schedule, he endeavored to show that any attempt to change the basis of the tax by charging it, not merely on the amount, but on the durability and the source of the income, would be "beyond the power of men to conduct with satisfaction." Class merged into class, schedule into schedule, income into income, and there were no natural lines on which an average of classes could be taken or on which it could be said that this income was durable, that uncertain, this part depended on brains and sinews, that part came without an effort. In a rough and ready way, the proportionate weight between professional and property incomes was, he argued, fairly satisfactory. To attempt to change the basis of the tax would be to break it up; and it was impossible to "break up the basis of the tax" without rendering the tax unfit "for service on an emergency," and without "throwing the whole finance of the empire into confusion." Repeal the tax, if you like, cried he, but do not destroy its utility.*

And at the general election of 1874 he placed the repeal of the income tax in the forefront of his address to the country, intending, as I understand, in some measure to replace it by a rearrangement of the death duties. His appeal was, however, rejected by the country, and during his subsequent years of office he has not scrupled to raise the tax when he has required additional revenue. We must, then, recognize it as a permanent portion of our fiscal system, but, though I am not in favor of the plans hitherto proposed with a view of placing it on a fairer footing, still it is impossible not to feel that there is much force in the objections raised against it. And I hope, therefore, that the tax will always be kept within moderate limits.

JOHN LUBBOCK.

* See Buxton, *Finance and Politics.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A MENACE TO LITERATURE.

BY MARGARET DELAND, AUTHOR OF "JOHN WARD, PREACHER," "THE OLD GARDEN AND OTHER VERSES," ETC.

JOURNALISM and Literature stand to each other very much in the relation of the Big Boy and the Little Brother.

Journalism, strong, eager, careless, goes striding along into the rich, mysterious future; concerning himself with facts rather than ideals, but intent upon great ends, even though hampered by the hundred frivolities and foolishnesses of his impetuous youth. By his side, stumbling and panting, his hand in the rough, good-natured clasp of the Big Brother, is Literature—running to keep up, grasping at a handful of flowers by the roadside, trying to catch a butterfly under his cap; a little cross now and then, inclined to whimper and pull back, but all the same compelled to keep pace with the hurrying stride of the Big Brother.

Which is all a way of saying that the newspaper strikes the note of human thought, and Literature echoes it; sometimes in voice that is true, and strong, and harsh; sometimes, with equal truth, in melody and beauty.

Journalism speaks the human passion for knowledge; and the man of science gives his wisdom to the world. Journalism says the people must be amused; and the novelist does his best, throwing in a piece of moralizing once in a while—though that is hardly fair, as the Big Brother points out, with no effort to spare the Little Brother's feelings. Journalism declares that the public mind is densely ignorant of Art; and a hundred books come tumbling from the press to teach and to inspire. Journalism utters the vast, patient, human longing for God, and Literature answers as best it may.

As they come, all these thousand books, Journalism does a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

double duty; for while with one hand he strikes the note which summons them, with the other he cuffs the Little Brother's ears if they do not please that Public for which he has demanded them. When they do please, he chucks Literature under the chin in a way that makes the Little Brother swell with pride; in both praise and blame he is unjust, though endlessly good natured—after the habit of his kind.

If this were all that Journalism did for Literature—if it gave the brotherly cuffs and snubs, the careful reminders that where a book speaks to a thousand readers, the newspaper speaks to a million, and that, therefore, it were well for Literature to keep his place and be modest; if it gave the occasional earnest blame and discriminating praise, the wholesome neglect of poor work and the consequent impulse to what was better—the Little Brother might well be grateful and adoring, after the manner of his kind.

But, alas, with the friendliest intentions in the world, Journalism, or, to be exact, personal journalism, is doing more to-day to injure the art of Literature than ever hunger and cold and neglect did!

No one will deny that a book, once finished, belongs to the world to which it is given. It is ready for criticism, nay, it invites it; if it is bad, an ideal journalism should show it no mercy; the sooner it is destroyed in the public mind by criticism, the better. But, whether the book be good or bad, the newspaper has no right to the author—so long, at least, as, in the eye of the law, he behaves himself. Yet personal journalism to-day is taking possession of the author: it is putting a subtle poison into his veins; it is misleading him as to the relative values of his work and his personality; it is fostering vanity; in a word, it is exploiting the artist, rather than the art.

One has but to turn to any one of the great dailies to see the methods which journalism pursues in this assault upon the arts —for literature is not the only sufferer. The drama has even more to bear!

The newspaper, as everybody will admit, is the measure of public opinion, and it cannot rise higher than its source; that is the excuse which journalism makes when it is reproached for the miserable and silly personalities (they are rarely more than this, rarely scurrilities) which deface the pages of the great daily

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

papers. "The public demands it," say the editors, sighing and shaking their heads; "*we* can't help it!" If one protests that one has never yet demanded to know that Mrs. Smith had a dinner party of sixteen, and Miss Jones was engaged to be married, the newspaper has an instant and unanswerable repartée: "Mrs. Smith wishes it to be known that she has had a dinner party. Miss Jones sent us word of her engagement!" If this be true, and there is little doubt that it is, the demands of the public are being gratified at a serious cost; a cost that can be expressed in one word—"self-consciousness."

This is bad enough for all of us, whether we have given a dinner party or whether we are engaged to be married, but in the case of the artist it is worse; for the poison of personal journalism affects not only his character, but his art. Swelling is the usual effect of poisons, and it has been said that with authors this horrible symptom show itself in the head; there is a consequent distortion of values, a shocking loss of perspective, a dreadful intrusion, into the art, of the personality of the artist.

In all seriousness, so grave is this threat to Literature, that it is surely time that authors looked for a moment beyond the pleasant haze of flattery with which personal journalism surrounds them, to see the indignity which is done their art, and the vulgarity which attaches to their characters.

As for the flattery, it is plain enough. A reporter, ordinarily both courteous and clever, calls upon an author and with a pretty word or two about his work begs to know his views upon anything—grave or gay, or lively or severe—it matters not.

"*What do you think will be the future of American literature?*"

"*What is your favorite color?*"

"*What are you going to have for your Thanksgiving dinner?*"

At first sight, the statement that to be asked such questions flatters an author seems absurd; but consider the weakness of the flesh! consider the inherent vanity of us all, nay, even the necessary vanity—the conceit which helps us over the hard fact of our own inadequacy and makes continued effort possible. To have one's opinion asked at all, is flattering, when one comes to think of it; to have it asked in behalf of a million readers is almost intoxicating. It is being lionized on a gigantic scale.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps that is why we cannot see how absurd we must appear to the observer, who, if he is kindly, will be as sorry for us as we were for Hagenbeck's lions when they went trundling about on bicycles—a sight to make the respecter of the king of beasts turn away his eyes for very shame and pity.

The author, to be sure, knows full well that his opinions upon such subjects as have been quoted are asked only because some book or paper chances to have brought his name before the public; he knows that the reporter will not ask his respectable and thoughtful neighbor *his* views. He even knows that his opinions, however profound and valuable they may be, would probably not be published if offered anonymously. But there his knowledge seems to end. He is not even able to perceive the utter inanity of such questions; and that inability is, perhaps, the most astonishing feature in the whole amazing and mortifying exhibition. Curiously enough, too, his sense of fitness deserts him, and the modesty which withholds him from shouting at a dinner table, unasked, his preference in colors, or his taste in cookery, does not restrain him from announcing, on the invitation of a reporter, at fifty thousand breakfast tables, that, to his mind, pink is more pleasing than blue, and that he will eat goose instead of turkey on Thanksgiving Day. He has acquired a belief in his own importance which would be pathetic if it were not ridiculous.

That such a belief is injurious to character cannot be doubted; that it is fatal to achievement must be borne in upon the minds of thoughtful persons who follow the work of the victims of personal journalism.

A writer, conscientious and consecrated to his work as he may be, begins, by and by, to see himself in it; little by little he confounds his own personality with his art; on every page, almost in every phrase, appears that distressing smartness, that straining for effect, which is the sad and unmistakable symptom of self-consciousness. If his book is praised, the author imagines that it is he who is praised; from being the servant, reverent and serious, profoundly conscious of the greatness of the art he essays to serve, deeply humble, and deeply joyous in his work, he becomes the master, and shakes his wares in men's faces to attract their attention to himself.

It will be objected that the willingness of authors to lend

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves to the flattery of personal journalism springs, not at all from vanity, but from the fear of offending the press, and also from simple amiability. As for the fear, it is surely unworthy of comment. But that good-natured authors do not like to say "no" to the reporter or to the entreating letter that begs them to name their favorite flower or their plans for spending the summer, is, of course, true enough. It certainly is not easy or pleasant to say "no" to one's brothers of the press, or, worse, one's sisters, who are harassed and haggard with efforts to get a stick-ful of matter to fill out a column, and round out a ten-dollar bill. Nevetheless, the candid writer must admit the flattery of the request, no matter what may be his real reason for acceding to it; and he must also be aware that as the newspaper merely announces his favorite flower or his vacation plans, and makes no mention of his amiability, it will not unnaturally be supposed that he has answered these questions for the mere joy of seeing his name in print!

One prefers to take this view, humiliating as it is, rather than that other, held by a good-natured but practical public, namely, that it is a way of advertising ourselves.

"Yes," says the busy man, glancing at a page in a newspaper headed: "*Symposium of Authors, Upon How they Mean to Observe Christmas Day.*" "Yes; they like to keep their names before the public; it gives their books a boom, I suppose. Let's see: *Jane Ann Jones* means to go to church on Christmas Day; well, that's not distinguished; perhaps I'll go myself. *William James Smith*—(why do they all put their middle names in?)—will spend his Christmas with his family. That's not unusual! Well, well, poor things; I suppose it advertises their books. By the way, what did either one of them ever write?"

The requests from newspapers to take part in symposiums differ in variety rather than vulgarity; or, to put it differently, the diversity in these chances for notoriety and free advertising is very great.

One newspaper publishes a composite poem, each line by a different writer; the whole ridiculous conglomeration an insult to poetry and a weariness to the reader. Another wishes to know the circumstances under which, as the reporter may express it, the author "took to writing"; a third proposes to enlighten the public upon the number of servants kept by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

author's wife, and also thinks it would be well to mention whether he wears russet shoes or sober black-leathers. Not long ago one newspaper gave nearly a page to an illustrated discussion of the different kinds of garters worn by certain actresses; and another really valuable periodical so far lost its sense of proportion, as to the importance of a man's work to his private opinions, as to send a list of questions to a number of authors of such a nature as these:

Who is your favorite poet?
What is your favorite book?
What is your favorite play?
What do you enjoy most?
What do you detest most?

Now, surely, the intelligent men and women who answered these inquiries—men and women to whom we owe much, whose keen insight into life has touched us a hundred times to laughter and to tears—surely these authors cannot, even in their most fatuous moments, believe that the tired world really cares to know that one most detests "getting the bottom of her dress muddy," and another most highly prizes "clean gloves?" They answered the questions smartly, or cleverly, or with a courteous gayety and wit worthy of a better cause; and some even answered them seriously, with an evidently conscientious effort to be exact. Which was amusing or pathetic, as one looked at it.

It would not have been courteous, but it could hardly have been less dignified, and it would at least have been true, had each of these amiable persons written across the inquisitive page:

"*None of your business!*"

It would be interesting to know who reads these banal and worthless opinions; of course, we all read our own, and possibly one another's; and it is whispered that each author buys at least a dozen copies to send to his friends—but who else reads them? It is hinted here and there that the newspapers use "symposiums" as padding, so that they may swell their terrible Sunday editions up to the thirty-two or forty-eight page limit. Cheap padding such symposiums are, in more senses than one; for the authors are rarely paid for their contributions.

One blushes for his craft when looking over such a page; the insult to our art is the first consideration; the pathos of ourselves the second. But it is useless, and it is also unjust, to abuse

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the newspapers for either. The matter is in our hands. Journalism cannot be expected to look after our taste or our morals—it is far too busy for either, and too good-naturedly indifferent.

But the Big Brother is really very well disposed to the Little Brother, and is willing to give him what he thinks is a lift now and then. He will tuck him under his arm, head down, very likely, with his little thin legs kicking in the air; the Big Brother is quite regardless of the indignity of such a position; he is giving a lift to a little fellow, which is surely all that can reasonably be expected of him; besides, it seems to entertain the passers-by to see an inverted author—so to speak—and that is all Journalism cares about. But if only Literature could see himself! If only he could realize that the one absolutely fatal thing in this world is to be ridiculous—how quickly he would reject such "lifts"!

But, after all, the remedy is in our own hands: we can refuse to be interviewed; we can refuse to caper whenever a newspaper pipes to us; we can refuse to hide our smirking self-consciousness, our pitiful egotism, under the sacred mantle of Art; we can learn not to think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think.

And surely the time has come for authors to take this stand!

MARGARET DELAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LATEST ASPECTS OF THE BRAZILIAN REBELLION.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE BRAZILIAN MINISTER AT WASHINGTON, SALVADOR DE MENDONÇA.

THE unexpected proclamation of the Brazilian Republic on the fifteenth of November, 1889, by a movement supported by the historical republican party and the land and naval forces of the nation, was followed at once by the establishment of a revolutionary dictatorship. There was no opposition worthy of the name. At the very moment when the last imperial cabinet was planning to inaugurate the third reign, preparing to dissolve the army and exterminate the democratic idea, which was already coextensive with the country, the last American monarchy was in its death throes. In all Brazil but one man was found to risk his life in defence of the decrepit institutions; and this man was a republican whom circumstances had made minister of marine and who resisted solely from a sense of duty to the dignity of his office. Even the husband of the prospective empress, the Count d'Eu, did not hesitate to surrender the right of succession in consideration of the offer of a round sum of money, and sent his sword as marshal of the army to the new minister of war, accompanied by a letter as memorable as despicable, in which he expressed his sorrow that circumstances did not permit him to serve Brazil under her new institutions—a sorrow inspired not so much by the loss of his sword and the honors of his high office as by that of its handsome salary. If he failed to receive the price of this sacrifice of his dignity to his well-known avarice, it was because the aged emperor refused to sacrifice his own, which would not allow him to consent to any pecuniary transaction.

In forty-eight hours the revolutionary flood swept away all that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remained of the empire, leaving nothing in its passage but the aged emperor and empress, who, surrounded by the imperial brood, were on the road to exile on board the "Alagoas," whence the messenger dove sent forth found no longer a monarchical land on which to rest her foot.

The provisional government set up by the revolution and accepted at once by the entire nation had at its head General Deodoro da Fonseca, and was composed almost entirely of historical republicans. The only exception was Ruy Barbosa, a former monarchist, a man whose learning is only equalled by his artfulness, and who, on the eve of the revolution, found, at the eleventh hour, the road to Damascus.

The first care of the new government was to give to the country, by means of dictatorial decrees, all the reforms indispensable to the new order of things, in order that the Brazilian republic might, like the Minerva of the ancients, spring into being armed from head to foot. Before it lay the unforeseen; even the republicans could hardly comprehend the entire inanity of the monarchical *régime* and the full extent of their easy victory. Indeed, history records no other example of such an almost phantasmagoric change from one system of government to another—without resistance, without protest, without armed strife, which have everywhere else been the baptism of liberty. The student, however, of Brazilian history would find this quite in accordance with the character of the people. The revolution of 1822, by which our independence was secured, was bloodless. That of April 7, 1831, which drove Pedro I. from the country, was also accomplished without bloodshed; and even in the "battle of the bottles" (*garrafadas de Março*) which preceded this movement, little damage was done beyond the breaking of a few Portuguese heads and the spilling of more wine than blood. In 1888 we accomplished the abolition of slavery "under the reign of the roses." Every victory gained by democracy in revolutions in Brazil has been likewise bloodless. Up to the present time the shedding of blood has been the privilege of the monarchy: it alone made martyrs; it alone stained its victories with blood. Not to speak of the colonial period and the first reign, it is enough to recall the suppression of the revolutions of Rio Grande do Sul, of Minas and São Paulo, and of Pernambuco.

An explanation of this apparent phenomenon, which is doubt-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less attributable in a great measure to the character of the Brazilian people, involves a truth that is worthy of mention. The Brazilian Army, with the exception of the few occasions when the danger of national disintregration forced it to take part against the people, has always been found on the side of popular liberty. On April 7, 1831, it fraternized with the people; in 1888 it refused to act as slave-hunter in the forests where the slaves, who had abandoned the plantations of São Paulo, Minas, and Rio de Janeiro had taken refuge, thus helping forward the cause whose triumph was assured by the decree of May 13, 1888; and, lastly, on the morning of November 15, 1889, it refused to serve the monarchy as the last prop which could stay its downfall.

It is quite fashionable in Brazil, even in the democratic ranks, to cry out against militarism. The late emperor, who gloried in governing a nation of bachelors and doctors of law, had a natural aversion to military men, and the two parties under his government, Liberal and Conservative alike, did not fail to slight the two branches of the service which in recent years saw themselves excluded, not only from all share in the government, which would have been no great evil if done for the maintenance of discipline, but deprived even of their constitutional rights by the civil power, an abuse against which they ineffectually protested. While the Duke of Caxias and the Marquis of Herval were living, the army had still in them two defenders in the government; but after their death both political parties, when in parliamentary opposition to the government, never failed to make use of the discontent of the military classes, until these discovered that they were merely serving as puppets, and in a single night they went over to the democratic ranks, and there they remain to this day, side by side with the people, supporting the constitution of the republic, not in obedience to the orders of any dictator, but inspired by their patriotic convictions.

One year after the proclamation of the republic the Constitutional Convention assembled, and, on the twenty-fourth of February, 1891, gave to Brazil its first republican constitution, modelled upon that of the United States of America; and its members having, by virtue of their election, resolved themselves into the first constitutional congress, put an end to the provisional government created by the revolution. The constitutional *régime* however, had not arrived soon enough to prevent the evil results

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the fever of speculation excited by the large issues of paper money authorized by Ruy Barbosa during his year of office as Secretary of the Treasury. Besides, the cabinet of the provisional government had been weakened by the withdrawal of the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, Señors Aristides Lobo and Demetrio Ribeiro, two historical republicans. Under the advice of unwise counsellors, General Fonseca, even before his election as president, formed his second cabinet, in which the only historical republican was Señor Justo Chermont, all the other secretaries being taken indiscriminately from the ranks of the former monarchists. The writer does not wish to be understood as advocating the exclusion from the administration of men who had served in the time of the empire : the error lay in the selection of the individuals.

If, instead of having himself elected president, or allowing his friends to present him as a candidate, the chief of the provisional government had used all his influence towards the election of a civilian, such as Señor Saraiva or Señor Paulino de Souza, both prominent leaders in the former monarchical parties, Liberal and Conservative respectively, but both true patriots who had accepted the new order of things, he would at once have placed the new republic upon a broad and solid basis, and under a flag whose ample folds would have covered Brazilians of every shade of political opinion. Instead of so doing or of organizing a new cabinet entirely republican, the new president surrounded himself with men of very narrow views, and who did not, with a few exceptions, even understand the form of government into whose service they were called. This was a step backwards ; Congress insisted on following the path marked out by the constitution ; the executive could not agree with the Congress, and a conflict was unavoidable. Wisdom would have dictated a policy of conciliation, but that wisdom was lacking in the president of the republic. The cabinet, as might have been expected in view of its origin, clung obstinately to the old parliamentary usages which were wholly out of place under the new form of government. The result was the dictatorial decree of November 3, 1891, which in violation of the constitution dissolved the federal congress, and declared the capital of the republic in a state of siege.

From the two extremes of the union, the States of Para and Rio Grande do Sul, came the first outcries of protest against this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attack on the constitution. Notwithstanding the approval, more or less sincere, by the governors of the other States, a revolution against the dictator broke out in the federal capital on the twenty-third of November, under the form of a revolt of the national fleet in the bay of Rio de Janeiro. Then, as now, Señor Custodio de Mello, who at that time was a member of the opposition in the Congress, headed the movement. A single high officer of the navy on that day opposed the revolutionary action of the squadron ; that officer was Saldanha da Gama, who eight days before had been promoted to the post of rear-admiral, and who at the time was stationed in Fort Villegaignon, with the command of which he had been intrusted by the republic. On that occasion, with a correct understanding of his duties as a soldier, he offered the first and only resistance to the attack of the revolutionists. In view, however, of his present position at the head of the rebel fleet in that same port, attacking the constitutional government of the nation, the rectitude of his proceeding on the former occasion is not so clear. He has exposed himself to the charge of defending the dictatorship, because, in violating the constitution, it threw discredit on a form of government with which he had no sympathy, though not because of the personal advantages he had gained under it. The dictator, recognizing the full extent of his error, to which his attention was called by a friendly power, and desiring to avoid bloodshed, resigned his office.

At that time the revolutionists had on their side a large majority of the Congress, while the only dependence of the president was a minority of the army, little disposed to support the violator of the constitution. The vice-president of the republic, Marshal Floriano Peixoto, took the seat of the retiring president as his constitutional successor. The dominion of law returned ; the Congress continued its labors ; the Lucena cabinet, which had fallen with the dictator, was succeeded by another made up of republicans taken from the opposition to the former administration. The direction of public affairs took quite another shape, and the honesty of the government barred the doors of the treasury against the irruptions of the stock speculators and the brokers in government concessions. It was the beginning of a new era, full of promise for the consolidation of the republic. Peace was established in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States; the disaffected in Rio Grande do Sul lay down their arms. Paternalism disappeared from the economic policy of the state; the government no longer sought its supporters in the stock exchange; Señor Rodriguez Alves, Secretary of the Treasury, wisely closed his ears to the outcries of the speculators and to the crash of falling enterprises, prudently separating the public funds from all the transactions which for two years it had supported so disastrously for the national welfare. By the side, however, of the new president was Señor Custodio de Mello, bold and crafty, full of personal ambition and resentment. It was through his influence and by his advice that the removal of the governors of States who had approved the violation of the constitution was begun. Local revolutions broke out in all directions. The governors who had not already been deposed made haste to resign in anticipation of a similar fate. The truth is that in these removals the intervention of the federal government was rather negative than active, inasmuch as its action was almost entirely limited to a refusal to use the power of the federal government to maintain in their seats the legally elected governors. It is not less certain, however, that these depositions weakened the respect for lawful authority and confidence in the new institutions, violating as they did the fundamental principles of constitutional government.

The reorganization of the government of the State of Rio Grande do Sul was made altogether in accordance with the views of Señor Custodio de Mello until the moment when the monarchical designs of the so-called federalist revolution of Señor Gaspar Martins were revealed, and Marshal Peixoto considered it his duty to interfere in the local struggle by furnishing the governor of the State with federal troops to repel the invasion which was threatened on the frontier of Uruguay. It is not difficult to see that a State of the union bordering on the territory of a foreign nation needs particular attention in the case of a rebellion whose forces are recruited in that territory. From November, 1892, to April, 1893, as a secretary in the cabinet of Marshal Peixoto, Señor Custodio de Mello aided and approved the policy of the former in relation to Rio Grande do Sul. In April, however, Señor de Mello retired from the cabinet, accompanied by his colleague, Señor Serzedello Corrêa, who, though his talents entitled him to take the lead, was contented in this case to serve as a follower. So far, so good; but a few months later, on the night of September 5,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the aid of thirty-six naval officers and half a dozen congressmen, Señor de Mello took possession of some of the vessels of the fleet and began the rebellion which is now tarnishing the good name of Brazil.

This rebellion has been prolific of manifestoes; they break forth in all directions. We have them from Señors Mello and Saldanha da Gama by turns proclaiming to the public their purposes and programmes, modifying them or denying them; we have them even from Ruy Barbosa, who after stirring up anarchy in Brazil, and teaching disrespect for the institutions he helped to create, is now in a foreign country engaged in slandering his own, and serving as the mouthpiece of the rebellion.

Señor de Mello in his first two manifestoes declared that his purpose was to restore the supremacy of the republican constitution, to overthrow military dominion, and to restore peace and credit to Brazil. He accused the president of violating the constitution in various ways, among which he made prominent the veto of a bill in relation to the presidential election, attributing the veto to the alleged desire of Señor Peixoto for re-election. It is curious that instead of appealing to the ballot-box, in which under the republican form of government, the remedy for all political evils should be sought,—particularly since the election for the second Congress was to take place, at the end of October last; and in the beginning of next March the presidential election will be held,—the rebel chief should propose to introduce into politics new methods of restoring violated constitutions, and should attempt to bring back peace and credit by cannon shots, and to destroy military dominion by military violence.

The charge in regard to the motives of the veto has no real foundation. In the opinion of a journal of the opposition the President could not have approved the bill in question, because its fifth article contained a twofold violation of the Constitution: in the first place, because it extended to the office of vice-president the ineligibility which the constitution limited to that of president; and secondly, because it extended to the entire presidential term the ineligibilty of the vice-president who had served as president, whereas, by the constitution it is limited to him who has thus served in the last year of the presidential term. It is the bill, then, that was unconstitutional, while the veto rests on the express declarations of the constitution. Besides

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this, Señor Peixoto was still further removed from the suspicion of being actuated by a personal motive, inasmuch as his ineligibility was already established by the constitution, and in no way depended on the bill, whether approved or not.

It is a pity that the personal ambition of Señor Custodio de Mello will not permit so satisfactory an explanation of his conduct; but it furnishes a very complete one of his political changes and of the blindness which led him to expect that a repetition of the twenty-third of November, 1891, would render it easy for him to breakfast on the "Aquidaban" and dine in the executive mansion. Fortunately for republican institutions in Brazil the circumstances were changed and the men were different, and the *coup-de-main* was a failure. The Congress at once authorized the government to declare a state of siege, furnished the executive with all necessary means for the defence of the national institutions, and, as the immediate representative of the nation, exhorted the States to continue united in defence of the constitution. The session was closed twenty days after the outbreak of the revolt.

Everything went wrong with the plans of the rebels; conspirators like Señors de Mello and Ruy Barbosa must have relied upon promises of support which they did not receive, owing to the energy of the lawful powers. There are two facts which support this assertion. A few days after the outbreak of the rebellion, Señor Ruy Barbosa, who from the very first night had kept himself in hiding, deemed it prudent to flee to Montevideo, and a banker who is said to have loaned a large sum to the rebels under promise of payment within eight days, seeing the time of settlement indefinitely postponed, concluded that he would do a better business by killing himself.

The chief of the rebellion said nothing about a political alliance with the monarchico-federalist rebels of the south; and if credit be given to the revelations published in the press of Rio de Janeiro by Lieut. Brazilio Silvado, Señor de Mello would listen to no suggestion of alliance with Señor Saldanha da Gama, on account of the well-known monarchist opinions of the latter. As long as possible he avoided competitors for the lead in the movement; sent Captain Lorena to set up a Robinson Crusoe government in the Island of Desterro, on the coast of the State of Santa Catharina, and for such a government he had the hardi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hood to ask of foreign nations a recognition of belligerent rights. A refusal was quick in coming, and this was another disappointment.

It was not till early in November that the leader of the naval revolt found it necessary to invite Señor Saldanha da Gama to join in the movement. The republicanism of Señor de Mello is not of the true temper. Just as he had, when ordered by the provisional government, landed on the coast of Asia, a grandson of the ex-emperor, so he would be capable of landing on the coast of Brazil another, if not the same, grandson, if circumstances should so demand. This was a contingency evidently accepted by him to gain the coöperation of Señor Saldanha da Gama. The correspondent of the London *Times*, which is always well informed in regard to what is going on among the rebels, advised that paper, in November, of this new alliance. It appears that there was some reluctance on both sides to enter into an agreement, because a full month elapsed before Saldanha da Gama publicly declared for the rebellion.

Señor da Gama, who was doubtless the most distinguished officer of the Brazilian navy, both in character and in talent, had taken a position in regard to the rebellion which it was impossible to maintain, and which was unjustifiable from every point of view. At the beginning of the rebellion he declared himself neutral, and maintained a semi independent position while yet occupying the post of director of the naval school and having under his command the government establishments on the Cobras and Enchadas islands, and the schoolships. He had hoisted in these places the flag of the red cross of Geneva, which had already served as a cover for the sham neutrality of the friends of the rebels in the south, who under the cloak of humanity were receiving, instead of medicines and surgical apparatus, death-bearing munitions of war. Even after the mask of neutrality had fallen, the red cross flag continued to float over a hospital on Enchadas island, although its basement was occupied as a deposit for warlike stores.

The so-called neutral portion of the navy followed Saldanha da Gama into the ranks of the rebels, and on the ninth of December the first manifesto of the new rebel leader was distributed through the federal capital, and attached to the walls in the form of a placard. Señor Mello, up to this time the leader of the rebellion,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was quite overshadowed by the prestige of his new recruit, and thenceforth occupied but a secondary place. In that manifesto the hopes of the monarchists found an expression too clear to be misunderstood:

> "The logic, as well as the justice of events, would authorize the restoration by the force of arms of the government of Brazil to the place it occupied on the fifteenth of November, 1889, when, in a moment of surprise and national stupefaction, it was overthrown by a military sedition of which the present government is only a continuation. The respect, however, which is due to the will of the nation, freely expressed, demands that it should select, solemnly and on its own responsibility, the form of government to which it wishes to entrust its glorious destinies."

A few hours later all Brazil knew that the rebels were playing their last card, and that card was the restoration of the monarchy; but the reply that was given by Brazil to Señor Saldanha da Gama was the same as that it had given to Señor Custodio de Mello. The answer was that in defence of republican institutions the support of the nation would be given to the lawful government. The foreign support on which the new leader counted likewise failed him, and before the end of December he found himself under the ridiculous necessity of declaring that it was the government that had had the seditious manifesto printed, had posted it at the street corners, and had attributed to him the plan of submitting to the people the question of a monarchical or a republican form of government; whereas his purpose was merely to submit the question of the form of a republic best fitted to Brazil.

The truth is that the leadership of Saldanha da Gama is no better than that of Señor de Mello, since by his first manifesto he offended the republican rebels, and by his second destroyed the last hope of his monarchist followers. And so that type of military honor from whose mouth we were waiting to hear the words of the cavaliers of Fontenoy—"*Tirez les premiers, messieurs les Républicains*"—let fall from his gloved hands the *báton* of command. Now there is nothing left for him to do but what was done in the good old times when men's words were worth more than the written law, by our ancestors, the stout knights of the battlefields of Aljubarrota, Centa, and India who went and asked their dead sovereigns in their tombs to release them from their vows of allegiance before surrendering to the enemy the positions they were set to guard. But Señor Saldanha da Gama has already two dead lords to awaken: the last emperor of Brazil, to return to him the sword which, without his permission, he put at the ser-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vice of Señor Deodoro da Fonseca; and then the first president of the Brazilian republic, to give back to him the insignia of rear-admiral, which he received for serving the republic, and which, on the 7th of December, he offered to wear in the service of the Prince of Gram Pará.

The part taken by Señor Saldanha da Gama in the naval revolt brings with it at least the advantage of putting an end to the system under which any ambitious leader arrogates to himself the right to speak in the name of the nation, and of disclosing the plans of monarchical restoration which have been until now a cloud on the republican horizon.

From the fratricidal strife which is now going on, the new institutions must come forth victorious, for the reason that in spite of all the difficulties incident to the reorganization of the country under the new form of government, despite the errors of the republican administration and the campaign of slander waged against it abroad by Brazilians unworthy of the name, Brazil has made within the last four years a progress unexampled in the time of the monarchy. The revenues of the state, which in 1888 amounted to about $72,000,000, are estimated for the present year at $116,761,000. The immigration, which in 1888 reached 131,745, rose to 218,930 in 1891. The States, relieved of the yoke of centralization, have in four years doubled their production, and have in almost all cases an annual surplus, a thing unknown during the empire, and which now enables them to effect their local improvements on their own account. New interests have arisen, with new men to direct them, and these cannot be dispossessed without the employment of a force far greater than that possessed by the naval revolt.

The interest of foreign nations, which in our times is directed rather to the conquest of new markets for their products than to rebuilding thrones for unemployed princes, lies in the re-establishment of peace in the great South American republic. In the unlikely hypothesis of the victory of the restorationists in Brazil, peace would be impossible because the re-establishment of the monarchy would be but the beginning of a civil war of indefinite length, which could only end like the Napoleonic adventure in Mexico: with one queretaro more and one emperor less.

SALVADOR DE MENDONÇA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW TO HELP THE UNEMPLOYED.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

AN EPIDEMIC of what passes for charity is sweeping over the land. From New York, where the new and massive United Charities Building, the million-dollar gift of one philanthropist, gives stately evidence that the battle against actual starvation has permanently transcended the powers of a municipality that appropriates to it millions annually and of the unorganized giving of greater millions; and from Chicago, where the corridors of the City Hall and the doors of churches have been thrown open for the shelter of those so poor as to welcome such a bed, to Seattle, on Puget Sound, or Tampa, on the Mexican Gulf,—all who have anything to give are being asked to give. Municipalities, churches, boards of trade, real-estate associations, labor unions and merchants' organizations are giving and asking for charity funds. Officials are surrendering a percentage on their salaries, policemen, railroad operatives, the employees of large business establishments, factory hands, and even day laborers, are docking themselves of part of their pay, and trades dinners being given up to swell charity subscriptions. There are charity balls, charity parties, charity entertainments, and charity funds of all sorts. One great paper in New York is raising an old-clothes fund, and another great paper a bread fund, and in Ashland, Wis., they have made a charity mincepie twenty-two feet in circumference and a quarter of a ton in weight. The politicians are always large givers of alms, politicians of the Tammany type especially; but even Tammany has special relief committees at work. One of the chiefs of New York's "400" calls on each pupil of the public schools for a daily contribution of a cold potato and a slice of bread for the organized feeding of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hungry; and to complete the parallel with the "bread and circuses" of the dying Roman republic, he also asks that the churches be opened and their organs played every afternoon, so that to free food may be added free music!

Yet there has been no disaster of fire or flood, no convulsion of nature, no destruction by public enemies. The seasons have kept their order, we have had the former and the latter rain, and the earth has not refused her increase. Granaries are filled to overflowing, and commodities, even these we have tried to make dear by tariff, were never before so cheap.

The scarcity that is distressing and frightening the whole country is a scarcity of employment. It is the unemployed for whom charity is asked: not those who cannot or will not work, but those able to work and anxious to work, who, through no fault of their own, cannot find work. So clear, indeed, is it that of the great masses who are suffering in this country to-day, by far the greater part are honest, sober, and industrious, that the pharisees who preach that poverty is due to laziness and thriftlessness, and the fanatics who attribute it to drink, are for the moment silent.

Yet why is it that men able to work and willing to work cannot find work? It is not strange that the failure to work should bring want, for it is only by work that human wants are satisfied. But to say that widespread distress comes from widespread inability to find employment no more explains the distress than to say that the man died from want of breath explains a sudden death. The pressing question, the real question, is, What causes the want of employment?

This, however, is the question that the men of light and leading, the preachers, teachers, philanthropists, business men and editors of great newspapers, who all over the country are speaking and writing about the distress and raising funds for the unemployed, show no anxiety to discover. Indeed, they seem averse to such inquiry. "The cause of the want of employment," they say, tacitly or openly, "is not to be considered now. The present duty is to keep people from starving and freezing, or being driven to break in and steal. This is no time for theories. It is a time for alms."

This attitude, if one considers it, seems something more than strange. If in any village a traveller found the leading men

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clustered about the body of one who had clearly come to untimely death, yet anxious only to get it buried; making no inquiry into the cause of death, and even discouraging inquiry, would he not suspect them of knowing more of that cause than they cared to admit? Now, this army of unemployed is as unnatural as is death in the prime of life and vigor of every organ and faculty. Nay, it involves presumption of wrong as clearly as cut throat or shattered skull.

What more unnatural than that alms should be asked, not for the maimed, the halt and the blind, the helpless widow and the tender orphan, but for grown men, strong men, skilful men, men able to work and anxious to work! What more unnatural than that labor—the producer of all food, all clothing, all shelter—should not be exchangeable for its full equivalent in food, clothing, and shelter; that while the things it produces have value, labor, the giver of all value, should seem valueless!

Here are men, having the natural wants of man, having the natural powers of man—powers adapted and intended and more than sufficient to supply those wants. To say that they are willing to use their powers for the satisfaction of their wants, yet cannot do so, is to say that there is a wrong. If it is not their fault, whose fault is it? Wrong somewhere there must be.

Of old it was said, "If any would not work, neither should he eat." Men able to work, and willing to work, who could not find work, were not dreamed of. External nature is the same; the constitution of man has not changed. How, then, is it that we now hear, "He who cannot find work shall be fed by charity"? Those who say this do not say, "He who does not work shall be fed by charity." These pseudo-philanthropists know the penalty of such an attempt to boldly annul the natural law that by his toil man shall be fed. By skimping the dole to what will just prevent actual starvation, and by the tests and inquiries and degrading conditions of organized charity, they try to draw the line between those who cannot find work and those who do not want to. But this line it is impossible to draw, for no such clear line exists. Organize charity as we may, men who cannot find work go hungry, and men who do not want to find work are fed, and men willing to work are converted into men unwilling to work.

For willingness to work depends on what can be had by work and what can be had without work, and the personal and social

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

estimate of the relation. Work is in itself painful and repellent. No human being ever worked for the sake of working. I write this article that it may be published in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, and that I may get the pay for it, and communicate my thought to others. But the work of writing it is as irksome to me as sawing wood. So with all work. In a ruder stage men looked upon the necessity of work as the curse of an offended creator. We who may now see to what marvellous advances it has led, and recognize in it the motor of all human progress, may behold in it, not a curse, but a blessing. But its irksomeness remains. What keeps any of us at work are our desires and hopes—our wants and our pride. Kill hope and lessen desire by crucifying the feeling of personal independence and accustoming your man to a life maintained by alms, and you will make of the most industrious a tramp. For the law of our being is that we seek the gratification of our desires with the least exertion.

Why should charity be offered the unemployed? It is not alms they ask. They are insulted and embittered and degraded by being forced to accept as paupers what they would gladly earn as workers. What they ask is not charity, but the opportunity to use their own labor in satisfying their own wants. Why can they not have that? It is their natural right. He who made food and clothing and shelter necessary to man's life has also given to man, in the power of labor, the means of maintaining that life; and when, without fault of their own, men cannot exert that power, there is somewhere a wrong of the same kind as denial of the right of property and denial of the right of life—a wrong equivalent to robbery and murder on the grandest scale.

Charity can only palliate present suffering a little at the risk of fatal disease. For charity cannot right a wrong; only justice can do that. Charity is false, futile, and poisonous when offered as a substitute for justice. This is the fatal taint that runs through all the efforts of the rich and influential to aid the unemployed, with which our newspapers now are full. Like the gatherings of clergymen called in Chicago by Editor Stead—blinded leader of the wilfully blind—their spirit is that of men pretending to look for what they are determined not to find; of men, like those of Moscow of whom Tolstoi tells, willing to do anything whatever to help the poor—except to get off their backs.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet this is to be expected. For the question of the unemployed is but a more than usually acute phase of the great labor question —a question of the distribution of wealth. Now, given any wrong, no matter what, that affects the distribution of wealth, and it follows that the leading class must be averse to any examination or question of it. For, since wealth is power, the leading class is necessarily dominated by those who profit or imagine they profit by injustice in the distribution of wealth. Hence, the very indisposition to ask the cause of evils so great as to arouse and startle the whole community is but proof that they spring from some wide and deep injustice.

What that injustice is may be seen by whoever will really look. We have only to ask to find.

What do we mean when we say that it is scarcity of employment from which the masses are suffering? Not what we mean when we say of the idle rich that they suffer from want of employment. There is no scarcity of the need for work when so many are suffering for the want of things that work produces, when all of us would like more, and all but a very few of us could advantageously use more, of those things. Nor do we mean that there is scarcity of ability to work or willingness to work. Nor yet do we mean that there is scarcity of the natural materials and forces necessary for work. They are as abundant as they ever were or ever will be until the energy radiated by the sun upon our globe loses its intensity. What we really mean by "scarcity of employment" is such scarcity as would be brought about were an ice sheet continued into the summer to shut out the farmer from the fertile field he was anxious to cultivate; such a scarcity as was brought about in Lancashire when our blockade of the Southern ports raised suddenly and enormously the price of the staple that English operatives were anxious to turn into cloth.

What answers to the ice sheet or the blockade? Need we ask? May it not be seen, from our greatest cities to our newest territories, in the speculation which has everywhere been driving up the price of land—that is to say, the toll that the active factor in all production must pay for permission to use the indispensable passive factor. Across the street from the City Hall of Chicago, where 1,400 men, "the great majority Americans by birth and almost all of them voters," have been this winter sleeping in the stone corridors, stands the Chamber of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Commerce Building, thirteen stories high. This great building cost $800,000. The lot which it covers is worth over $1,000,000! A few blocks from where the New York *World* is to-day distributing free bread, land has been sold since the bread distribution began at the rate of over $12,000,000 an acre! As for the remotest outskirts, who has not heard of the mad rush for the Cherokee Strip?

If there are any who do not see the relation of these facts, it is because they have become accustomed to think of labor as deriving employment from capital, instead of, which is the true and natural relation, capital being the product and tool of labor. The very term "scarcity of employment," and its opposite, "scarcity of labor," come to us from a state of society in which the idea of labor employing itself directly on land had been forgotten. The primary suggestion of "scarcity of employment" is that the supply of labor for hire is in excess of the demand for its purchase. But the intervention of an employer by no means alters the relation between labor and land. As the price that labor must pay for land increases, the more difficult it becomes for laborers to employ themselves, and the less of the products of their labor can they retain; hence the larger the proportion of laborers forced to seek the wages of an employer, and the lower the wages to which their competition with each other drives them. While, on the other hand, the demand for labor by employers—those at least who hire labor in order to sell its products,—is determined in largest part by the demands of those who draw their purchasing power from what they get by their labor, since they are and always must be the great majority of any people. Thus the same increase in the price that labor must pay for land, which increases the supply of labor offered for hire, and decreases the wages it can ask, lessens also the demand of employers for such labor and the wages they can pay. So that, whether we begin at the right or the wrong end, any analysis brings us at last to the conclusion that the opportunities of finding employment and the rate of all wages depend ultimately upon the freedom of access to land; the price that labor must pay for its use.

"Scarcity of employment" is a comparatively new complaint in the United States. In our earlier times it was never heard of or thought of. There was "scarcity of employment" in Europe,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but on this side of the Atlantic the trouble—so it was deemed by a certain class—was "scarcity of labor." It was because of this "scarcity of labor" that negroes were imported from Africa and indentured apprentices from the Old Country, that men who could not pay their passage sold their labor for a term of years to get here, and that that great stream of immigration from the Old World that has done so much to settle this continent set in. Now, why was there "scarcity of employment" on one side of the Atlantic and "scarcity of labor" on the other? What was the cause of this difference, of which all other social and political differences were but consequences? Adam Smith saw it, and in his "Wealth of Nations" states it, but it did not need an Adam Smith for that, as every one who knew anything of the two countries knew it. It was, that in this country land was cheap and easy to get, while in Europe land was dear and hard to get. Land has been steadily growing dear in the United States, and as a consequence we hear no longer of "scarcity of labor." We hear now of "scarcity of employment."

In the first quarter of this century an educated and thoughtful Englishman, Edward Gibbon Wakefield, visited this country. He saw its great resources, and noted the differences between the English-speaking society growing up here and that to which he had been used. Viewing everything from the standpoint of a class accustomed to look on the rest of mankind as created for their benefit, what he deemed the great social and economic disadvantage of the United States was "the scarcity of labor." It was to this he traced the rudeness of even what he styled the upper class, its want of those refinements, enjoyments, and delicacies of life common to the aristocracy of England. How could an English gentleman emigrate to a country where labor was so dear that he might actually have to black his own boots; so dear that even the capitalist might have to work, and no one could count on a constant supply ready to accept as a boon any opportunity to perform the most menial, degrading, and repulsive services? Mr. Wakefield was not a man to note facts without seeking their connection. He saw that this "scarcity of labor" came from the cheapness of land where the vast area of the public domain was open for settlement at nominal prices. A man of his class and time, without the slightest question that land was made to be owned by landlords, and laborers were made to furnish a sup-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ply of labor for the upper classes, he was yet a man of imagination. He saw the future before the English-speaking race in building up new nations in what were yet the waste spaces of the earth. But he wished those new nations to be socially, politically, and economically newer Englands; not to be settled as the United States had been, from the "lower classes" alone, but to contain from the first a proper proportion of the "upper classes" as well. He saw that "scarcity of employment" would in time succeed "scarcity of labor" even in countries like the United States by the growth of speculation in land; but he did not want to wait for that in the newer Britains which his imagination pictured. He proposed at once to produce such salutary "scarcity of employment" in new colonies as would give cheap and abundant labor, by a governmental refusal to sell public land, save at a price so high as to prevent the poorer from getting land, thus compelling them to offer their labor for hire.

This was the essential part of what was once well known as the Wakefield plan of colonization. It is founded on a correct theory. In any country, however new and vast, it would be possible to change "scarcity of labor" into "scarcity of employment" by increasiug the price put on the use of land. If three families settled a virgin continent, one family could command the services of the others as laborers for hire just as fully as though they were its chattel slaves, if it was accorded the ownership of the land and could put its own price on its use. Wakefield proposed only that land should be held at what he called "a sufficient price"—that is, a price high enough to keep wages in new colonies only a little higher than wages in the mother-country, and to produce not actual inability to get employment on the part of laborers, but only such difficulty as would keep them tractable, and ready to accept what from his standpoint were reasonable wages. Yet it is evident that it would only require a somewhat greater increase in the price of land to go beyond this point and to bring about in the midst of abundant natural opportunities for the employment of labor, the phenomena of laborers vainly seeking employment. Now, in the United States we have not attempted to create "scarcity of employment" by Wakefield's plan. But we have made haste by sale and gift to put the public domain in the hands of private owners, and thus allowed speculation to bring about more quickly and effect-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ually than he could have anticipated, more than Wakefield aimed at. The public domain is now practically gone; land is rising to European prices, and we are at last face to face with social difficulties which in the youth of men of my time we were wont to associate with "the effete monarchies of the Old World." To-day, as the last census reports show, the majority of American farmers are rack-rented tenants, or hold under mortgage, the first form of tenancy; and the great majority of our people are landless men, without right to employ their own labor and without stake in the land they still foolishly speak of as *their* country. This is the reason why the army of the unemployed has appeared among us, why pauperism has already become chronic, and why in the tramp we have in more dangerous type the proletarian of ancient Rome.

These recurring spasms of business stagnation; these long-drawn periods of industrial depression, common to the civilized world, do not come from our treatment of money; are not caused and are not to be cured by changes of tariffs. Protection is a robbery of labor, and what is called free trade would give some temporary relief, but speculation in land would only set in the stronger, and at last labor and capital would again resist, by partial cessation, the blackmail demanded for their employment in production, and the same round would be run again. There is but one remedy, and that is what is now known as the single-tax —the abolition of all taxes upon labor and capital, and of all taxes upon their processes and products, and the taking of economic rent, the unearned increment which now goes to the mere appropriator, for the payment of public expenses. Charity can merely demoralize and pauperize, while that indirect form of charity, the attempt to artificially "make work" by increasing public expenses and by charity woodyards and sewing-rooms, is still more dangerous. If, in this sense, work is to be made, it can be made more quickly by dynamite and kerosene.

But there is no need for charity; no need for "making work." All that is needed is to remove the restrictions that prevent the natural demand for the products of work from availing itself of the natural supply. Remove them to-day, and every unemployed man in the country could find for himself employment to-morrow, and his "effective demand" for the things he desires would infuse new life into every subdivision of business and in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dustry, even that of the dentist, the preacher, the magazine writer, or the actor.

The country is suffering from "scarcity of employment." But let any one to-day attempt to employ his own labor or that of others, whether in making two blades of grass grow where one grew before, or in erecting a factory, and he will at once meet the speculator to demand of him an unnatural price for the land he must use, and the tax-gatherer to fine him for his act in employing labor as if he had committed a crime. The common-sense way to cure "scarcity of employment" is to take taxes off the products and processes of employment and to impose in their stead the tax that would end speculation in land.

But, it will be said, this is not quick enough. On the contrary, it is quicker than anything else. Even the public recognition of its need, by but a part of the intelligence and influence that is now devoted to charity appeals and schemes, would have such an effect upon the speculative price of land as to at once set labor and capital to work.

This is not "mere theory." It is theory to which all experience testifies. New Zealand is to-day the one country which enjoys anything like prosperity in the midst of a universal depression. While population is leaving New South Wales and Victoria, and, in the search for cheap land, people are even emigrating to Paraguay, more than six thousand families have settled in New Zealand since the passage of the Ballance Act, a partial application of the single-tax principle.

HENRY GEORGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARE WE A PLUTOCRACY?

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

THE god from whom the supremacy of the moneyed class has its modern name was said by the Greeks, who invented him, to be "blind and lame, injudicious, and mighty timorous. He is lame because large estates come slowly," they said. "He is fearful and timorous, because rich men watch their estates with a great deal of fear and care." He is in lineage only a half-god, or a three-quarters god at most, and some think him little better than an allegory. There are others who hold that this Plutus is the same as Pluto, who rules in Hades; but this is probably an error of those who do not understand the real nature of capital. It is no doubt through some such error that his name has hitherto been used to stigmatize, but it is not too late to ask that it should be used to characterize. At any rate, it seems to me that one may inquire without offence whether the term plutocrat will justly characterize not only all the rich people, but the infinitely greater number of the poor people in this republic.

I.

I know that some will object to the word, and scent in it a certain odor of incivism, but I do not know why it should aggrieve any one who is not ashamed of making money. I do not say earning money, for that is a very different thing; and to the few among us who feel it right to earn money, but wrong to make it, I might well offer my excuses if I called them plutocrats or imagined them willingly consenting to a plutocracy. None others need be afflicted either by the name or the notion, unless they are at heart afflicted by the thing, or have dimly or distinctly a bad conscience in it. The question for each one to answer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

himself, before he rejects or accepts the name or the notion of plutocracy, is whether it is just for him to profit by another man's labor, or, in other words, to pay another man a wage for doing or making a thing which shall be less than the value of the thing done or made, that he may have some margin of gain for himself from it, without having helped do it or make it.

I am aware that this is the whole question of private capitalism, but I am not for the present dealing with it except as a test of plutocracy. The man who follows a trade or practises an art, does so to make a living; the man who goes into business, does so to make money. These are broad distinctions, and they do not give all the colors of motive in either case; but their general truth cannot be gainsaid. No one makes money at a trade, or in the same sense at an art; properly speaking, money is not made at all in the trades or in the arts, though in the arts a great deal more money may sometimes be earned than is made in business. But business is the only means of making money, and in these days it may be fairly said that no man gets rich by his own labor, that no man gets rich except by the labor of others. Whether he gets rich or not, however, the man who pays wages with the hope of profit to himself is a plutocrat, and the man who takes wages upon such terms, believing them right, is in principle a plutocrat; for both approve of the gain of money which is not earned, and agree to the sole arrangement by which the great fortunes are won or the worship of wealth is perpetuated. I am not saying that the worship of wealth is wrong, or that the love of money is the root of all evil, or that the rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven, or any of those things: I am merely trying to find out whether this cult is not so common among us that our state is not rather a plutocracy than a democracy. The fact of any man's plutocracy is not affected by his having the worst of the bargain, and it is not affected by his failure to turn it to account if he has the best. The ninety-five men who fail in business and get poor are as much plutocrats as the other five who prosper and get rich, for the ninety-five meant to get rich, with as worshipful a mind for Mammon as the five had, and they believe in Mammon quite as devoutly. So I think it unjust to devote certain millionaires among us, or all millionaires, to the popular hate, and to bemoan the immense mass of would-be millionaires who failed in the same conditions that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

others prospered in. One may indeed blame the conditions which mean failure for so many and success for so few, but one can no more blame the good luck of the few than one can blame the bad luck of the many.

II.

For much the same reason only a qualified compassion can be given to the wage-takers so far as they believe that it is right for the wage-givers to get rich on their wages, while they themselves remain poor on them. A great deal of sympathy is asked, and a great deal more is offered unasked, in their behalf, which might better be kept and used in the cooler form of reason. If the wage-taker believes the system is wrong, that it is wrong for him to work for any employer but the state, which cannot allow itself to exploit him or make a profit on his wages, one may, of course, call him a miscreant or a fanatic, but one cannot deny him a logic which is lacking to the others in their discontent. Any other sort of wage-taker is ready at the first chance to become a wage-giver, and to prosper as far as he can upon a margin in the value of the thing he gets some one else to make beyond the wage he gives for making it; and with this hope in his heart, he is as thoroughly a plutocrat as any present millionaire of them all. Perhaps he is even more a plutocrat, for it is said that great riches oftener inspire great loathing of riches in those who have them than in those who have them not.

Since I believe that the vast mass of our wage-takers, either because they have thought about it or because they have not, are in this position, and so are potential moneyed men and potential millionaires, I find it hard to be of their side always in their struggles with the actual wage-givers. I have, indeed, always a crude preference for the man who wants to make a better living, over the man who wants to make more money; but when I begin to scrutinize my preference, I begin to distinguish. I begin to ask myself why I should be in the wage-takers' camp, rather than the wage-givers', if they are themselves ready to go over to the enemy as soon as they have money enough. This question saves me from much intense feeling concerning strikes, which I might otherwise wish to see carried by the wage-takers. At the end of the ends, the wage-payers seem to be doing only what the wage-takers would do if they had the chance, and I do not see why I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should espouse their cause, simply because I know that the great multitude of them will never have the chance. A strike for higher wages does not at all reach the plutocratic principle and is never against it. If the wage-takers do not like the plutocratic principle, if they do not like the chances of the fight which must go on under this principle, why do they perpetuate the fight?

In asking the question, I am not saying that the fight is wrong. I know too well that a multitude of my fellow-citizens, so great that it is hardly worth while to count the few others, think that the fight is a holy war, and that, if it does not make for virtue, it makes at least for character, and if not for blessedness at least for manliness. I believe it is recommended on this account to the working classes, who are invited to consider whether, if they gave up their chances of getting worsted in the fight, they might not have to give up the fight itself; and these classes, for the present, seem unwilling to forego their peculiar disadvantages, though by this time they must know that in the actual conditions it will be with them to the end as it has been from the beginning. In the mean time it is interesting to consider how long the great mass of the American people have constituted the American nation a plutocracy and not a democracy.

III.

This, after a vast deal of talking, is still a very nice question, which one cannot handle too delicately or too diffidently. On the economic side, unless we are the more deceived by appearances, one might say that there was really no such question, and never had been; but that here as everywhere else, the conditions always forbade a democratic management. Up to the present moment no business enterprise in the United States seems to have been carried on by universal suffrage, any more than in Russia, or the other parts of Christendom where universal suffrage is unknown. Our wage-takers are in precisely the case of wage-takers all over the world, and have not only not a controlling voice in the management of affairs that concern them far more vitally than they concern our wage-givers, but they have no voice at all. This may be right, or it may be wrong, but it is certain that financially, industrially, economically, we are not a nation, a people, a solidarity, but a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

congeries of "infinitely repellent particles." Politically, we stand before the world as Americans against England, or France, or Spain, whichever threatens our pride or our prosperity; but economically we are all at war one with another, quite as ruthlessly as we are at war with Englishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards. Politically, we can agree upon what is to our advantage by a popular vote, but economically we can never agree by that means, because politically our advantage is always individual, and economically it is always several. The fact does not need illustration; it illustrates itself from every man's experience to every man's reason. It is clear that business can never be democratically transacted, but must always fall to the control of one strong head, or long head, in the present economic conditions. Every private business is at war not only with every like private business, but it is at war within itself between the employer and the employee, the wage-giver and the wage-taker; and this state of double warfare can only be despotically maintained. If the employees were suffered to canvass any project they might find that their advantage lay apart from their employer's with the employees of some other employer, and they can no more be suffered to do this or to vote upon such a canvass than the subordinates of an army could be suffered to reason and to act upon their reason in the presence of an enemy, with the chances of a final fraternization.

IV.

The question that remains is, How far has business characterized our politics? Has business come into control of the government, or is the government still in the hands of the people? Do parties or persons bribe voters in New Hampshire or New York? Do firms or corporations corrupt legislatures? Have United States Senators bought seats in the most august assembly in the world? Have trusts and syndicates darkened counsel in the judiciary? Have large contributors to election funds received high office from the executive? Have contractors even tempted aldermen, and have the bosses behind the thrones found their account in tacitly growing rich in a private station?

I affirm none of these things, and until I have found some journalist who admits the guilt of his own party while accusing his esteemed contemporary's, or some boss who confesses that he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not so poor as his affluence makes him appear, I do not think it would be safe to do so. The proof in all such cases has as little weight with the impartial mind as the overwhelming evidence, say, that there are veridical phantoms. Still, it must be owned that there are vast numbers of people who believe that these things are so; not so vast as the number that believe in ghosts: but a majority of the Americans so great that their vote would not leave a single elector to the partisans of an opposite theory in a presidential election. It is hard to believe that there is no truth in them, just as it is hard to believe that the spirits of the departed have not upon some emergent occasions revisited the earth. I can account for their acceptance by supposing that the minds of the whole people have been poisoned by bad men, who have instilled into them a suspicion of guilt in others which every American knows himself personally incapable of.

Or is there here and there an American who secretly, and quite within the fastnesses of his heart, realizes that, being perplexed and wrought upon in the extreme, he would give or take a bribe? Or, if not quite that, is there some American who is conscious that, as a matter of business merely, he might apply business principles to politics? We all know how very common business principles are with us, and the thing is not so wholly impossible. We need not inquire very nicely what business principles are; some business men will do what other business men will not do; but if the popular notion that business is business be correct, and if in this sense business is a thing not wholly indistinct from righteousness, it can be easily seen that the passage from an axiom to an action need traverse no great moral space. If we once admit that business principles have been applied in procuring statutes, decisions, contracts, and appointments, as most Americans believe, then it might certainly be said that we have a plutocracy, and not a democracy.

In certain forms, indeed, we have grown more democratic. We have no longer that distinctly plutocratic form, the property qualification of the suffrage. But if votes are bought and sold, the spirit of money-making, of plutocracy, arrives in our politics all the same; and if there is a change in the motive of those who seek public office, if men have come to desire it for the profit rather than the honor, we are more plutocratic than we were when we were less democratic. For a plutocracy is not so much,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or not so merely, the rule of the moneyed class as it is the political embodiment of the money-making ideal; and the mass who have no money at all may cling as fondly and worshipfully to this ideal as the class who have millions of money. In fact, if we have ceased to be a democracy and have become a plutocracy, it is because the immense majority of the American people have no god before Mammon; though they may have gods besides him, he is the first. If we have really come to the pass in election, legislation, and administration that so many believe we have reached, we have come to it not because any limited number of men have pushed us on, but because the way that we were mostly going led to it. We may plead that our opportunity of prosperity, transcending any prosperity known before, tempted us beyond our strength; but if the student of our status is to sympathize with any one of us rather than with any other, it must be through that humanity which commiserates misfortune because it is misfortune, and will not ask itself whether it may not be merited misfortune. To this humanity riches may be pitiable, too, and a millionaire may inspire as tender a compassion as a pauper. Perhaps too little has been made of the sufferings of the rich; no one but they can know how hard the life of luxury, the life of satiety, or even the life of fashion may be.

V.

The mere absence of statistics on such a point will not keep us from speculating as to the truth in the case; and a certain obscurity attending this whole inquiry piques rather than blunts the curiosity. It cannot be supposed that a great people would have voluntarily become a plutocracy without finding their account in it, and it would be very interesting to know what this is. If a plutocracy is a decline from a democracy, the study of the fact will have something of the pathetic and poignant charm that clings to ruin. If it is a rise, the contemplation of it must stir the patriotic heart with pride, and impress the alien with the grandeur of the spectacle.

In either case, when did we begin to pass from the democratic to the plutocratic stage of our existence as a people? There was no dramatic moment which history could lay her finger upon with confidence, and the transition was not the effect of any conscious purpose. But I suppose the impulse toward it was always

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

latent in us, not perhaps more tightly coiled than the same spring in any other nation, but having more effect because from the first hour of our national life the business spirit was supreme with us. We came into being at a time in the world's life when this spirit was entering upon its dominion, and there was no tradition or institution to hinder it or to hamper it with us. We had neither prince, nor priest, nor patrician to stand against the trader, the manufacturer, the business man, and it was only a question of very little time when these should rule. Of course, no one clearly foresaw this, and even in the retrospect there are appearances that cloud a perfect vision. The chief men in the new state were apparently the statesmen, and for a long time nearly all men were so poor in it that it seemed destined forever to be the free domain of an equal manhood. The poet, when he imagined that

> "God said: I am tired of kings,
> I suffer them no more,"

figured him further as proclaiming:

> "I will divide my goods;
> Call in the wretch and slave:
> None shall rule but the humble,
> And none but Toil shall have.
>
> "I will have never a noble,
> No lineage counted great;
> Fishers and choppers and ploughmen
> Shall constitute a state."

But when it came down to business, as our phrase is, and there was a call to go and "cut down trees in the forest, and trim the straightest boughs" for the wooden house which was to be the capitol of the new state, not only the digger in the harvest-field was summoned, not only the hireling, but "him that hires," too; and, without doubt, the business man, the moneyed man, the capitalist, was early on the ground to charge the market price for the timber used, and bid off the contract for building the temple of our liberties. Even at that day he must have begun to feel himself a public benefactor because he "made work" for the choppers and ploughmen at wages which secured him a handsome profit. He was the first-born of *Laissez-faire*, and as an eldest son he took over the whole property, so that he should be able to provide for the brood of artisans, operatives, miners, stokers, sailors, stevedores, laborers, who came

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after him. These little brothers of his, though they hate him, envy him his power of using their work to his advantage, and would mostly like to be in his place. They declare that he has never provided fairly for them, but they conceive nothing better than the part he plays in civilization; and I venture to say that if I were to speak lightly of him I should seem to most of my fellow-citizens, of all classes and callings, little better than one of the wicked. But I have no wish to speak lightly of him or otherwise than historically, or, at the worst, analytically; and I hope that I may say, without offence, that during the whole period of our generous youth, before the triumphant close of the great civil war gave us our full growth and solidified and hardened us, he was comparatively in abeyance. There was still thought to be some good, which, if we had not a very definite vision of it, was a better good than the material good which he sought as the supreme blessing. There were always, of course, mighty men before Agamemnon, but before the war the large fortunes were such as would have seemed little fortunes after the war; the greatest crimes against the suffrage, the legislature, the judiciary, would have seemed small crimes, and political life was not yet so low in the popular esteem that a high-minded man might not make it his career without the misgiving of his friends. It was still ennobled by the question of slavery, by the highest interest that ever divided a people, or parted the just from the unjust. When that question had its answer in the last reason of kings and passed from our politics, our politics lost the motive that had carried them upward and onward. They became, in a sense, business affairs, with no question but the minor question of civil-service reform to engage the idealist's fancy or the moralist's conscience. After the war we had, as no other people had in the world, the chance of devoting ourselves strictly to business, of buying cheap and selling dear, and of marketing our wares at home and abroad.

VI.

I need not tell the tale of our material achievements: it is so familiar and, upon the whole, it is so tedious. With us, Plutus may have remained blind, but if he remained lame he has proved himself a very active cripple. He has gone far and he has gone fast; but there are those who doubt whether he has arrived

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

everywhere. They say that the defects of our advantages are so terrible that the wealth we have heaped us is like witch's gold in its malign and mocking effects. If we have built many railroads, we have wrecked many; and those vast transcontinental lines, which, with such a tremendous expenditure of competitive force, we placed in the control of monopolies, have mostly passed into the hands of receivers, the agents of an unconscious state socialism. The tramps walk the land like the squalid spectres of the laborers who once tilled it. The miners have swarmed up out of their pits, to starve in the open air. In our paradise of toil, myriads of workingmen want work; the water is shut off in the factory, the fires are cold in the foundries. The public domain, where in some sort the poor might have provided for themselves, has been lavished upon corporations, and its millions of acres have melted away as if they had been a like area of summer clouds.

It is true that we still have the trusts, the syndicates, the combinations of roads, mines, and markets, the whole apparatus. If there is much cold and hunger, the price of food and fuel is yet so high as to afford a margin to the operators in coal and grain and meat. The great fortunes in almost undiminished splendor, remain the monuments of a victory that would otherwise look a good deal like defeat, and they will be an incentive to the young in the hour of our returning prosperity. The present adversity cannot last forever; and if there are many thousands of men and women who cannot outlast it, or live to see the good time which is coming back, this has been the order of events from the beginning of the world, and we must not shut our eyes to the gain because it involves a great deal of loss.

If the owners of these great fortunes are often, or sometimes, men of low civic ideals and small civic uses, it must be allowed, on the other hand, that men of no fortune at all are often, or sometimes, no better. Whether a close scrutiny of their respective qualities and characters would tell more for the rich, or more for the poor, in the regard of the moralist, is by no means certain, and is perhaps beside the main question. But there is no doubt that they imply one another; that in our system they must both exist, that neither can exist without the other. There must always be this contrast, it appears, for it is said by the statisticians, by the ready reckoners whose figures cannot lie, that if all the wealth of the nation were equally divided, we should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

none of us have above six hundred dollars; and it ought to be plain how much better it is that one should have twelve hundred, and another none; or one should have several millions, and several millions should have none. Such points need no argument with any man who has money—say, money enough to buy this copy of the REVIEW; to the man who has not money enough for that purpose, I cannot suppose that I am addressing myself, and I cannot stay to convince him. If I must address him, I would rather spend the time in persuading him that it is he and such as he who are responsible, or chiefly responsible, for the perpetuation of a plutocracy among us, if we have a plutocracy.

I should be ashamed to use the word to stigmatize any class of my fellow-citizens, even the poorer class whom no one need be afraid of offending, but I wish to use it only to characterize, as I said in the beginning. In this truer use, indeed, it will characterize the status in the whole civilized world; and perhaps it will characterize the status with us only a little more strictly, a little more closely. The plutocratic spirit is a bond uniting all the modern nations, otherwise so discordant and antipathetic: Englishmen, Germans, Frenchmen, Italians, Americans, we are alike brothers in that solidarity. But with some of the peoples whom it joins, it seems not to be the first thing. Even England, so long the chief, and still the first, to make the plutocratic principle in the industries a cult and a creed, has shown of late a shrinking from the full effect of its logic. It may strike the reader as rather a droll notion that the English should be thought the earliest to acknowledge the opposite principle of humanity, but a little study of the facts will make it look less grotesque. It is among the inventors of *Laissez-faire* that the inhumanity of *Laissez-faire* has repeatedly met its severest rebukes. It is the English who have finally realized, in the forms of law or in legal usage, the wrong of paying the workman the least he will take for his work, and in their imperial contracts have stipulated that the contractor shall pay his hands the trades-union rates of wages; while the War Office has adopted the eight-hour rate without decrease of pay. It is the English who have rejected the contract system altogether in some of their municipal dealings with labor, and have gone directly to the workingmen for the work that they wanted done. It is the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

English who have built decent public tenements where the poor may be housed at cost, and need not pay landlords ten, and twenty, and a hundred per cent. for shelter in dens and styes. It is English public opinion which has recognized the principle that the miner's wages must never go below a certain sum, no matter how low the price of coal may fall. These things are the effect of a larger humanity than is yet active among us, and are a confession that business is not the supreme English ideal. Is business, is money-making, the supreme American ideal ?

VII.

If the poor American does not like it, or if he does not prefer a plutocracy to a democracy, he has the affair in his own hands, for he has an overwhelming majority of the votes. At the end, as in the beginning, it is he who is responsible, and if he thinks himself unfairly used, it is quite for him to see that he is used fairly ; for, slowly or swiftly, it is he who ultimately makes and unmakes the laws, by political methods which, if still somewhat clumsy, he can promptly improve. It is time, in fine, that he should leave off railing at the rich, who are no more to blame than he, who are perhaps not so much to blame, since they are infinitely fewer than the poor, and have but a vote apiece, unless the poor sell them more. If we have a plutocracy, it may be partly because the rich want it, but it is infinitely more because the poor choose it or allow it.

W. D. Howells.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEEDED MUNICIPAL REFORMS.

I. OUR PRESENT OPPORTUNITY.

BY THE REV. C. H. PARKHURST, D. D.

DIFFICULT as it is to arouse public opinion, there is still a greater difficulty in harnessing down that aroused opinion into discreet and concerted action. No one can be knowing to the present condition of sentiment in this city, as expressed in the common speech of men, and as reflected in the public journals, without being assured that if enthusiasm and indignation were all that are required in order to a municipal revolution, the necessary material is amply in hand. Unfortunately, however, sentiment, no matter how honest and well-intentioned, cannot be counted on for safe, and least of all for concerted, efforts. There are not a great many intelligent and reputable people in this city, and scarcely a respectable journal, but what antagonize strenuously the existing *régime*. Now if all that were required was a plebiscitum, in which each citizen had only to vote for or against the continuance of Tammany control by a "yes" or "no" ballot, probably the business could be pretty easily finished. The intelligence and conscience of the city are quite solidly arrayed *against* the administration now existing, but there are not evident the symptoms of a similar consensus *in favor* of any other mode of administration to take its place. Destructive agreement is an easy matter, and this city is full of it; but constructive agreement is a rarity and a luxury. This is the rock upon which municipal reform has been wrecked in times past, and there is a possibility, not to say a probability, that it will be wrecked on the same rock next November.

Political revivals are in that particular somewhat like revivals of religion. Churches of various denominations will, in seasons of religious interest, combine for evangelical effort, with little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consciousness of their interdenominational incompatibility, and the appearance will be that incongruities have been eliminated, and that the lion and the lamb have indeed lain down together. And yet the case has very often been that just that suspension of hostilities has been the occasion of accumulating only a fresh and enhanced supply of interdenominational virus, and I have known of no religious bitterness that rivals that which sometimes develops between churches in the process of capturing the converts after a series of "union services." Human nature is a singular thing, and there is a great deal of it. The illustration we have just used states fairly the condition we are in to-day. We are passing politically through what may be termed a series of "union services." The lion and the lamb—in fact, all the animals except the tiger—are lain down together. There is a harmonization of sentiment that is almost millennial. This harmony, however, is replete with vast possibilities of jealousy and rivalry, and the confidence with which Tammany Hall faces the coming November election is based, to a considerable degree, on its appreciation of that fact. Our purpose in so stating the matter is not to discourage the hopeful, but it is poor philosophy to deal with a situation without having first taken its honest measure.

There exist at the present time a considerable number of reform movements in New York that are agreed in their purpose to destroy Tammany, but that are just as distinct from one another in the complexion of the administration which they desire respectively to establish in its place. Each of these reform movements is aiming at precedence in the overthrow of existing conditions, and each of them already regards with a jealous eye the efforts that are being made by its competitors to marshal the approaching campaign. A man or a clique may be intensely interested in the weal of his city, and yet be still more interested in the success of his personal or political scheme for the compassing of that weal; and when it comes to be a matter between the saving of his city, and the success of his own plan for saving, he gives the preference to the latter, and sacrifices the municipal interest rather than see victorious any rival policy for the promotion of that interest. This has occurred repeatedly in the recent history of this city, and it is extremely probable that it will occur again this year. There are reputable Democrats who are laboring and praying for the overthrow of Tammany Hall, that would nevertheless

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather see Tammany Hall win than to see a Republican elected mayor; and there are Republicans in large number that are guilty of precisely the same sort of political bigotry. They will not confess it, perhaps are not even aware of it; they will not vote the Tammany ticket next November, but they will do what is in effect precisely the same thing: they will refrain from casting an anti-Tammany ballot, and thus become the passive auxiliary of the very condition against which they are to-day laboring and praying.

This is a truth to be stated promptly and urgently. There is being a good deal of hard, honest work done in behalf of our wickedly misgoverned city, and we are some of us continually nettled and acerbated by the reflection that there are political experts of every stripe that are lounging ambitiously around waiting for the opportunity to capture the movement in the interests of their own party or prepossession, posing as reformers till the critical moment comes, and then seizing upon the opportunity with precisely the same hungry rapacity as that which distinguishes the municipal administration we are suffering under already. Unpleasant as the fact may be, it must nevertheless be appreciated by the rank and file of our reputable citizens that a great deal of the bitterness with which Tammany Hall is regarded by some of our conspicuous citizens who have been taking a long political vacation is due exclusively to the fact that they are tired of going barefoot, and are hunting for dead men's shoes. The municipal enthusiasm that is developing among certain political "back numbers," certain Republican and Democratic corpses that have been lying in grave-clothes for some years, waiting for the resurrection tattoo, is too transparent to baffle the perceptions of intelligent citizens who care to take the candid measure of the situation.

The times are ripe for the reconstruction of our municipal life, and the general desire and demand that exist among us for something better will not fail of being realized unless the movement is sidetracked, or unless it is employed for partisan purposes or is prostituted to the promotion of individual ambitions. This is a movement of the people, and the people must not allow themselves to surrender their control of it. Professional politicians have not been the authors of it, and it is not, therefore, a thing to be committed to their custody. The people, as such, have rights here, and one of their rights, and one of their obli-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gations too, is to assert themselves in all that relates to the municipal interest. One of the charges that have been popularly laid against Tammany Hall is its system of "bossism." At present, one man determines our municipal character and administration. Now, it must be urged upon the popular attention that what is needed is not an exchange of "bosses," but the abolition of "bosses." The names can be easily specified of those who are voluminous in their vituperation of Mr. Croker, but whose enmity to him is based, not on the autocratic position he holds, but on the fact that his occupancy of the position cuts them out from occupying it themselves.

The doctrine to be preached in all these matters is that no system of half-measures will hit the urgency of the times or be level to the popular demand. If Tammany control is to be overcome next November, it will be at the pressure of a tide of wisely directed popular enthusiasm, and it will be far easier to develop the requisite enthusiasm by presenting to it men and measures that meet the entire demand, than by presenting to it men and measures that meet the demand but half way. Thoroughness is the prime condition of permanency. If we simply *better* our condition next November, we might about as well remain as we are. Such a result would not pay for the effort it would cost, for we should presently slide back into our present state, and have to repeat the tiresome farce of self-extrication. We do not like machine politics, but we would most of us just as soon be the victim of machine politics that spells itself "Tammany Hall" as the victim of machine politics that spells itself by any other or more reputable name. It is the *thing* we object to, not the name that is tagged to it; and now is a good time to get rid of the *thing*; and we shall get rid of it if, at the popular demand, the politicians are kept from spoiling the movement.

There was probably never in this city so earnest and clear-cut a conviction as now that in all municipal matters the distinctively political element should be reduced to a minimum. People who never said it before are saying it to-day, that the affairs of our city should be administered in the interests of our city, and not in the interests of the office-holders, and not in the interests of any national theory or policy. Conducting the concerns of New York is a business, and the people, with a phenomenal unanimity, are demanding that it should be conducted on business

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principles. New earnestness is given to this consensus by the example of the new Mayor of Brooklyn, who proposes to embody that principle in his administration. When the time comes here, as it has in so many of the English cities, that candidacy for official position means above all integrity and competency to fill the position, we shall wonder that it took us so long to graduate from the senseless opinion that a man's national convictions determine his qualifications for municipal trust, and that his views of tariff, or of any other national issue, ever touch the matter of his fitness to stand at the head of a city or at the head of any of its administrative departments.

We, in New York, are in the condition we are in to-day for the reason that our local character and concerns have been so long subordinate to considerations of a national character, and we are, a good many of us, tired of it and disgusted with it. We want the political element of our municipal life exterminated. There is probably not one intelligent and conscientious man out of fifty but what assents to that when the issue is fairly put; and the men who do not assent to it are those who have some ulterior ambition of their own to further, or who are willing to purchase the aggrandizement of their own party at the expense of the economy, thrift, and honor of their municipality. The rank and file of the people are coming out very distinctly upon this ground, and it behooves them to stand firmly by their conviction, and not to allow themselves to be either bulldozed or hoodwinked by the specious machinations of the self-constituted leaders who are trying to make political capital out of the "dear people" whose interests they are affecting to espouse. Instance the matter of a non-partisan police board. At this writing it is proposed that such board should be composed of two Republicans and two Democrats. Certainly a non-partisan board is less mischievous than one that is predominantly either Republican or Democratic; but the legislated obligation to put upon the board two men that are distinctively of one party, and two men that are distinctively of the other party, will be certain to have two evil effects: the first of which is that it will "tie" the board on all questions that involve political considerations — a fact which is amply illustrated by past attempts to secure the conviction of police captains before such a two-headed commission; and the second is that it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will legislatively fasten the political feature upon municipal government, just at a time when men are more anxious than ever before to get rid of political features. The sooner we get rid of the whole system of police commissioners, the better; such a system affords a nest for all sorts of political machinations to breed in, and, by distributing responsibility, makes it impossible definitely to locate responsibility. At present the superintendent shoulders the blame for non-enforcement of law upon the police commissioners, and the commissioners reciprocate. No one knows the exact point at which either credit or blame is to be attached. The whole effect of our present quadruple commission is to handicap the superintendent, to obfuscate the field of his accountability, and to confuse the entire department by the introduction of ingredients that are foreign to the proper purposes of the department, and to the specific advantage of the municipality. There is no more necessity for the introduction of a commission between the mayor and the superintendent of police than there is for a bureau of control between the agent of a manufactory and the heads of the respective departments into which that manufactory is organized. We shall have neither a safe nor an effective municipal government till it is so relieved of unnecessary machinery that we shall know precisely what to find fault with when things go wrong. A good deal of the present difficulty in dealing with our police department lies in the fact that, corrupt though it be in its entire animus and working, everybody in it hides behind everybody else, and it is next to impossible to pin obligation anywhere. It will be the politicians that will oppose the abolition of such commissioners, for that would be to diminish by so much the number of lucrative positions; and when you have robbed a politician of boodle and patronage, you have taken from him everything that in his estimation makes government dear.

Our "municipal opportunity," therefore, is to be interpreted not simply in its relations to an escape from the despotism of Tammany, but to the emancipation from the domination of whatever self-constituted authority undertakes to bind us to its behests. What the citizens of this city want is, not an exchange of masters, but deliverance from all masters save that of the collective will. That is the line along which educating influences will have to be made to bear in the months that are to come. Politi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cians that are "in" will make jest of such a policy; so will politicians that are "out," but that want to get "in"; but the rank and file of us believe in home government; and when we say home government, we mean not only New York city's government of itself as opposed to government from Albany, but our own individual government of ourselves and participation in the governmental influences that go to compose our municipal character and history. The best thing we can do for months to come will be, not to talk about candidates, and not to draw the net of partisan interest with which we may be severally affiliated, but to prevent the present municipal earnestness from mortgaging itself to any man, movement, or party; to make people intelligently and burningly conscious of the immediate situation; to go on uncovering the crookedness with which the members of our present city government have warped themselves, and the filth with which they have begrimed themselves; to be steadily drawing to a finer tension the motives and purposes of our citizenship; to protest untiringly against the adoption of any half-measures or compromise candidates; steadily to emphasize the moral element involved in the present warfare, and so to lift the struggle above the level of petty ambition and sectional prejudice that the popular mind shall become more and more elevated and insistent in its demands, and that its choice of leadership be determined, not by the scheming of a cabal, nor by a policy of barter and dicker, but by the wide drift of event and the high exigencies of the hour.

C. H. PARKHURST.

II. JUGGLING WITH THE BALLOT.

BY JOHN W. GOFF, COUNSEL TO THE COMMITTEE FOR THE PROSECUTION OF ELECTION FRAUDS.

AT a mass meeting held under the auspices of the Bar Association of the City of New York at the Cooper Union last October, a committee of fifty was appointed to invite the co-operation of citizens, irrespective of party, to secure as far as possible an observance of the election laws. A number of gentlemen volunteered to act as watchers at the polls on election day, and while it was, under the circumstances, impracticable to man each of the 1,157 polling-places in the city, yet there was a sufficient

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number placed under observation to warrant a fairly accurate estimate of the general practice. Since the enactment of the reform-ballot law in 1890 no organized effort has been made to watch its operation or to detect any illegal practices. The public was satisfied with the popular catch-name of the act, and it slept peacefully upon the assurance that fraud was no longer possible; but the evidence obtained by the volunteer watchers, and the finding of over sixty indictments by the Grand Jury, mainly against election officials, demonstrate that false registration, false voting, and bribery are as easily and as safely practised as they ever were, and that perjury has enormously increased, owing to the number of safeguards which must be sworn away by the fraudulent voter and the collusive inspector.

During the last seven years there has been a great increase of cheap lodging-houses in the city of New York, whose capacity for accommodation is limited only by the number of lodgers that can be crowded around the stoves and upon the benches. The inmates of these lodging-houses are the nomads of our civilization, with no home, no family ties, no cares for nor interest in government or country, and who around election time are contracted for at so much a head to register and vote. On the days of registration these floaters registered mythical names, giving the lodging-house as their residence. In a majority of cases they claimed to be native-born citizens, and, if naturalized, that they had been naturalized in another State. Of course it may be said that if they swore falsely they were liable to punishment for perjury. That is true, but how is the perjury to be proven? Who can swear that such a man is not the owner of the name he has given, or that he is not a native-born citizen? There is no record to appeal to, and he is practically safe from contradiction. As to the period of his residence in the district, he is equally safe. There is no register or record kept in the lodging-houses; the only formality required is the payment of a small sum for the night. The lodgers usually turn in late at night, and are turned out early in the morning. They rarely spend three nights in succession in the same house. And these tramps, many of them criminals, each registered one or more names which were certain to be voted on by themselves or some other tramps on election day.

The same men who registered did not, as a rule, vote upon the names given. To have them do so would require their main-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tenance at the lodging-house, and that would be too expensive. A more economic plan was adopted. A few days previous to election the proprietors of the lodging-houses were furnished, by the election-district captains, with lists of the names registered from their houses. Separate slips for each name were then supplied, and on election day the tramps, as they came along, were handed the slips, and they voted on the names thus given as frequently as they could get the slips. The election workers were never hard pushed to bring out the registered vote. They simply sent for the men when they wanted them, and were always supplied with the required number. Sometimes the floater forgot the name given to him or could not read the slip; sometimes a man who could not speak English wrestled with an American name, or an English-speaking man struggled with a Polish name. In all of these cases the obliging inspectors helped them out either by looking at the slip or by giving some sort of pronounciation to the unpronounceable name. In some election districts there was a rivalry as to who could vote on the most names, and the man who won the honors was an ex-convict, who voted eighteen times in two election districts of the Third Assembly District. At another election district of the same Assembly district, four ex-convicts voted upon the names of four well-known men in the neighborhood, one of them being a German who kept a wine saloon next door to the polling-place, and was personally known to the election inspectors for years. It is generally accepted that even in presidential elections the vote falls off from the registration ten to twenty per cent.; but in those districts where the lodging-house flourishes, the full registered vote was invariably polled, and the trouble was not in swelling the vote to the number registered, but in keeping it down to that figure, as the supply of voters was inexhaustible. In the Thirtieth Election District of the Second Assembly District, which comprises a single block, there were registered from one small house two stories high above a liquor store, 62; from three houses, 239; and from thirty-one houses, 620. The full registration was voted in this district, and there being but 600 minutes of legal voting time, the rate was a vote a minute and twenty over.

In the Thirty-sixth Election District of the same Assembly District, from four lodging-houses there were registered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and voted upon 337 names. At this polling-place men went in and voted, came out and took their place in line to vote again. There were counted in this assembly district 12,770 votes, and the result of a careful and conservative calculation shows that at least 5,000 of this number were fraudulent votes. In 1892 there were registered from forty houses 1,410. In 1893 from the same houses there were registered 2,105. From one lodging-house in the Second Election District of the Third Assembly District, 183 names were registered and voted upon. From twelve houses in the same district there were registered and voted upon 382 names. The keeper of a well-known lodging-house on the Bowery, an ex-convict for election frauds, was captain of his election district, and whenever the voting became dull he sent around to his lodging-house for a fresh supply. It will be seen that this system of padding the registry is the necessary prelude to the fraudulent voting on election day; it is simple and inexpensive, and under the present administration of public affairs is reasonably safe from detection or prosecution.

The arrangements of the polling-places were in many instances designed for the perpetration of fraud. Doors from the rear portions of polling-places opened into hallways, and the retiring-booths were so arranged that the workers could go into them from the hall and prepare the ballot for the voter. In other places the booths were ranged in a row, leaving a passageway in the rear, and in the backs of the booths a piece of the muslin was slit out and a man stood there ready to fix the ballots for the voter as soon as he entered. In very few of the election districts was the law observed as to the time of closing the polls. It depended largely whether the full registry list was polled; if it was not, the election-district captain sent to gather in sufficient floaters to complete the list, and the pools were kept open to accommodate him. At one polling-place in the Tenth Assembly District the doors were closed at four o'clock and a piece of paper pasted over the slot in the ballot-box. The inspectors and poll clerks were preparing to canvass the votes when at fourteen minutes past four o'clock the captain hurried with a voter to the door, which was opened, the voter was rushed to the booth, the paster covering over the slot was broken, and the vote received. At a number of polling-places the ballots were secretly marked, and the inspectors, in handling the ballots, had no difficulty in ascertain-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing, by their sense of touch, from the size, the weight, and the mucilage of the blanket pasters used by the different parties, how the voter had voted.

The provision of the law permitting a blind or disabled person to have assistance in the booth in the preparation of his ballots was perverted into a means for the perpetration of the most shameless perjury and fraud. There were three classes of voters for whose especial benefit the plan was put into operation : *First,* the man who could neither speak nor read the English language ; *second,* the English-speaking man who could not read his ballot ; *third,* the man who it was suspected would not vote the Tammany ticket. These men were accosted on the street or in neighboring saloons, and as soon as the price was fixed, ranging from one dollar and a half to two dollars and a half, they were instructed to go in and take the oath of physical disability, and then select as their guide to the booth the "worker" who stood at the guard-rail. In some cases a pretence was kept up by the worker guiding the assisted voter to the booth, but in the majority of cases all disguise was thrown aside and the performance became a roaring farce. In one election district of the Eighth Assembly District twenty men, mostly colored, took the oath of physical disability, and each of them was accompanied into the booth by the worker, who put the prepared ballot either into the hand or the hat of the voter and stood by him until it was delivered to the inspector. No one of these men was in any sense physically disabled, and the frequent perjuries became the subject of jokes and laughter. One of the "blind" voters, immediately on depositing his ballot, asked for a match to light his cigar, and, seeing one on the floor about six feet away, stepped over and picked it up. Another "blind" voter, when leaving, was warned by a bystander that there was a pin on the floor and not to fall over it ; whereupon the "blind" man stooped down and picked it up. Another voter received his ballots in the ordinary way and retired to the booth ; in a few minutes he came out and said he could not fold his ballots ; the ballot clerk showed him how ; he retired again, but in a little while came out and returned the ballots, saying that he could not tell the Tammany ticket. He went outside the polling-place and in a few minutes returned with the "worker," took the oath of physical disability, was allowed the assistance of the worker in the booth, and this time his ballot was cast in the regulation way. A vol-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unteer watcher protested against what he termed an outrage, even the police officer remonstrated, but the inspectors saw they had no discretion, but were bound to accept the votes.

In some districts the inspectors construed the oath of physical disability to mean illiteracy, but in no instance was the law observed as to the form of the oath or as to noting on the poll-lists the particular disability sworn to, or as to recording the name of the person assisting. It was the common practice for the inspectors and poll clerks to fill up and sign during the day the blank statements and certificates which they were required to make at the close of the canvass, leaving the figures only to be inserted. This was not only a violation of law, but for obvious reasons afforded facilities for fraudulent computations and returns. Even if the minority inspector was disposed to object to a false count—a thing so extraordinary that it did not happen—the majority inspectors having the returns already signed could afford to ignore him; in other words, it was furnishing certificates in advance during the day for what was to take place at the close of the polls.

The names of men well known in their respective districts, and personally known to the inspectors, were voted upon early in the day, so that when the leisurely citizen went to cast his vote he was promptly challenged. In some few districts he was allowed to swear his vote in, but in the greater number he was not, particularly as it grew late in the afternoon, and the chances of a *mandamus* grew less. The names of many respectable Tammany men were voted upon; and when the owners went to vote, their mild complaints were assuaged by the assurance that the ballot already in was the same as they would have voted. A striking example of the extent to which this was carried was furnished in one election district of the Second Assembly District, where a floater voted on the name of the Chairman of the Board of Inspectors. The chairman did not even question, much less challenge, his impersonator, but gravely announced that he himself had voted on the ballot deposited by the floater.

Discipline and rigid political organization were never better exemplified than in the thorough and systematic fraud practised in counting the votes. The uniformity with which certain methods was adopted precludes the belief that they were spasmodic; but on the contrary it forces the conclusion that they were epidemic in conformity to a general policy. As soon as the polls

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

closed, the election-district captain assumed command. If a volunteer watcher demanded admission he was either kept without the guard-rail or, if admitted, he could not get near enough to the table to see the ballots, owing to a number of broad-shouldered men who, from their hustling capacity, secured the front places. All had blank printed forms of watchers' certificates signed by some candidate or officer of a party organization. It may be noted that watchers' certificates signed in blank convey no authority and are wholly insufficient in law. The whole number of ballots found in the ballot-boxes were first counted. This number should tally exactly with the poll clerk's list, showing the number of voters actually polled, and with the ballot clerk's last consecutive number, showing the number of ballots actually delivered to voters. Almost without exception there were more ballots found in the ballot-box than the ballot clerk's number showed to have been delivered or the poll-list showed to have been voted, and in a great number of districts more than the registration. How they came there is to some extent a mystery; but in some places ballots were folded in duplicate, and in others the pile of ballots on the table was added to by a sleight-of-hand performance. Where an excess of ballots is so found, the law provides that they shall be thoroughly mingled, and that an inspector shall, without seeing, approach backward and draw out indiscriminately a number of ballots equal to the excess. This law was improved out of existence. The ballots were first opened, then the Democratic ballots were placed in one pile, the Republican ballots in another, and the People's, the Prohibition, and the Socialists' in respective piles. The piles were then placed one on top of the other, the Democratic at the bottom, the Republican next, and the other three without regard to the order. An inspector then walked backwards and felt for the top of the pile, and from that top took the number in excess. One district illustrative of many was the Seventh Election District of the Third Assembly District. Here five hundred and eight names were registered, 495 votes were cast, and 567 ballots were found in the box—an excess of seventy-two ballots which were drawn in the way described, from the top of the pile. In the Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and Twenty-second Election Districts of the Second Assembly District every name registered was voted upon, and every vote cast was given to a certain candi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

date, and yet a considerable number of men in each district have sworn that they voted for another man. In another Election District of the same Assembly District the inspectors took a number of a certain party's ballots and put them in the stove without waiting for even the formality of a count.

A wholesale attempt was made to count the party ballots as straight tickets without regard to scratches or individual pasters. It was anticipated that the principal scratching would be on Judge Maynard; hence in the count the inspectors rushed the Democratic ballots as straight, but the volunteer watchers, though jeered and frequently threatened, insisted that scratches be noted, individual pasters be counted, and by their efforts many thousands of votes were saved from a false canvass. It was a common practice to count the ballots by tens, each ten counting one, two, three, and so on; when all were counted, the total sum of numerals was multiplied by ten, and the result ascertained. While counting, a friendly misunderstanding frequently occurred between the inspectors as to the number of tens counted—for instance, whether it was six or seven or eight or nine—and it was invariably settled in favor of the highest number, thus making it easy to add one or more tens to the actual vote. Once the total figures were settled upon, they became immutable, and no amount of proof produced by the watchers, either of fraud, mistake, or miscalculation, could alter the infallible inspectors.

It would not be just to lay the blame exclusively upon the Tammany inspectors, though, of course, being in the majority and in full control, they were chargeable with all that took place. Republican inspectors either openly co-operated with or quietly acquiesced in the perpetration of the fraud. Many poll clerks and ballot clerks, who serve as such to escape jury duty, were not wilful wrongdoers, but were either ignorant of or indifferent to their duties, but whether from criminal intent, acquiescence, ignorance, or indifference, the result was the same —a great and organized crime was committed against the elective franchise.

JOHN W. GOFF.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TERRITORIAL SOVEREIGNTY AND THE PAPACY.

BY THE RIGHT REV. MONSIGNOR BERNARD O'REILLY.

THE Roman correspondents of some of our great newspapers assure us that both Leo XIII. and King Umberto are in danger of being compelled to fly from Rome. This can be news only for such as have not made themselves well acquainted with the condition of Italian politics, or who only look with a careless eye on the symptoms of approaching European convulsions.

Long ago some of the official organs of the Revolutionary party in Italy formally declared that, in case of a great European war, it would be exceedingly difficult for the Pope, the Papal Court, and the Roman clergy to escape with their lives from Rome. The return to power of Signor Crispi, extremely hostile as he is to the Papacy, is a guarantee that the danger of such a massacre is now, happily, a remote one. For Crispi is, I believe, sincerely devoted to the kingdom of Italy, and adverse to the sanguinary schemes of the Revolutionists and their allies, the Anti-Christian Masonic societies in the peninsula. Another publicist, a man of great repute and great authority, Signor Boughi, is credited with the saying that "On the day when Leo XIII. would leave Rome by the *Porta del Popolo*, Umberto, with his dynasty and his court, would also have to leave it by the *Porta Pia.*" Wherefore should a general European war, as so many predict, break out, or let loose in Italy, and especially in Rome, the volcanic passions now seething and boiling over there, the government of King Umberto will find its vital interests involved in protecting the Vatican and securing the lives and liberty of its occupants. Should Pope and King, in the eventuality of war, have to fly from Italy, we know from the history of the past century that Leo XIII. or his successor is as likely to return to Rome as the heir to the crown of the new kingdom of Italy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Once more meanwhile the mighty question "Ought the Pope to be temporal sovereign of Rome?" not only agitates all Italy, but forces itself on the attention of the Old World and the New. I have called it a mighty question, because all nations whom we designate as Roman Catholic, or who possess, like Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, a considerable minority of Catholics, cannot help being interested in a subject which so deeply moves the Catholic conscience. Above all must it be considered a mighty question, because it intimately concerns the two hundred and twenty millions of human beings who revere in the Bishop of Rome the vicar of Christ, and look up to him as their divinely appointed teacher and guide in all things spiritual. A question which so nearly touches their convictions and their conscience as the perfect independence and freedom of the head of the church in the fulfilment of his high office as Bishop of Rome and pastor of Christ's entire flock must, by its very nature, agitate the whole Catholic world, the whole civilized world, in fact, so long as it is left undecided. This agitation and unrest has manifested itself in every Catholic congress, in every national or provincial assembly of Catholics held yearly during the last half century in European countries. The first act of all such assemblages, that even of the first Catholic congress held in the United States in the autumn of 1889, was to protest to the world that the Pope was not free in his own episcopal city.

What, then, constitutes this Roman question?

There are two very distinct aspects of it, which, to a superficial observer, would appear one and inseparable. The first is, "Should the Pope, being what he assumes to be, and what his immense flock believe him to be—the vicar of Christ on earth, the supreme visible head of the Christian Church—be made, for the free discharge of the mission imposed on him, absolutely independent of the sway, the domination, and dictation of any one sovereign or people?" And, secondly, since he is, and has been so long acknowledged to be, the Bishop of Rome, "Should the Pope not enjoy this absolute freedom and independence in Rome itself?"

Catholics maintain in substance that the head of the Church should, in the present as in the past, be in possession of a territorial sovereignty placed under the protection of international law, with its rights and limits guaranteed by the nations

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of both hemispheres. Without such a territorial sovereignty the Pope could only be the guest of some one nation, while in practice and reality he would be the subject of the sovereign power, monarchical or democratic, affording him hospitality.

Looking at this side of the question as two hundred and twenty millions of Catholics look at it, and viewing the dependent and precarious situation imposed on the Pope by his not being a territorial sovereign, or by his being, as was Pius IX., and as is Leo XIII., a mere nominal sovereign, or rather a prisoner in the Vatican, it is manifest that such a position of dependence is repugnant to the idea of the Pope's office as ruler of the universal church.

The Pope, as Christ's vicar and pastor of the whole flock, belongs to all humanity. We are here taking for granted what Catholics believe on this head, and what the logical consequences of such belief impose as a practical necessity. As Pope, the Bishop of Rome belongs to no one nation; he is the minister and servant of all. His mission, divine, universal, perpetual, and unfailing—as he and his Church believe and proclaim it to be—embraces all peoples and all time. The spiritual authority which he wields is and ought surely to be superior to the revolutions and contingencies of civil states and governments. His ministrations—in the hypothesis of the divine constitution of his church, of her saving labors among our race, and her supreme obligation to carry on Christ's work of redemption and sanctification—are superior in their object and nature to those of all earthly societies. Being in favor of all mankind, and ordained by God as such, all nations, rulers, and governments should encourage, protect, promote these ministrations and labors.

It should be the supreme interest of all mankind, of all, at least, who believe in the divine mission of the Church, and the authority of her visible head, to remove all obstacles to that mission, to render these ministrations and the exercise of that authority ABSOLUTELY FREE.

Nations and governments which, like our own, profess and practice great respect for religious freedom and the rights of conscience, must have a regard for the claims of such a body as the Catholic Church, demanding that its visible head should not be the creature, the slave, or the subject of any one empire, kingdom or republic, but an independent sovereign, free, in his own house

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and domain, to extend his care to the whole earth, as Christ has commanded him. Protestant statesmen, impartial and unprejudiced Protestant students of history, will not and cannot deny that the civil principality of the Popes, as it was constituted before the Reformation, was the creation of the then existing Christendom. The right of the Popes to Rome and to the States of the Church was a vested right, more ancient than that of any sovereign or state in Europe, and in that right every single member of the Catholic Church participated.

International law, during a period of twelve hundred years, had sanctioned an arrangement by which the Bishop of Rome, held to be the common parent of the entire Christian family, was given in his Episcopal city a territorial sovereignty which made him independent of any one people or power. Catholic nations, like individual Catholics, were greatly jealous, during the middle ages, as they are jealous at this day, of any interference with the freedom of the Bishops of Rome in governing the Church Universal. Nations and individuals had then a right, as they have now, as they must ever have, to see that the Pope was free in his own city, and to have it manifest to the eyes of the whole world that he was perfectly free. There must be no superior authority in Rome which the Pope and his counsellors have to consult, to yield and defer to, before issuing instructions destined for the entire church, before laying down the *law of life and morality* for Catholics when error is abroad and corruption is overflowing every floodgate. The civil principality of the Popes must be a neutralized principality, on which none may make war and which should be ever at peace with all; because the divine mission of the Church and her pontiffs is a mission to souls which neither war nor pestilence should ever interrupt, trammel, or delay.

Every Christian people has a right to know and to feel that its relations with the Holy See are not influenced by the interference or dictation of a hostile, an unfriendly, or even a friendly nation. The moment, for instance, that our government at Washington had good reason to believe that the ministers of King Umberto in the Quirinal were exercising on Leo XIII. or his Secretary of State, or his Prefect of the Propaganda, a pressure in any way hostile or adverse to our country or its interests, it would be brought home to American Protestants why the Pope should be free, independent, sovereign in Rome, and master in his own house.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What happened in New Orleans two years ago led to serious complications with Italy. The kingdom established by the Piedmontese only feels secure by leaning on new friends and casting off the old. The day may come when, to avoid war between this country and Italy, a worse thing might be done than to invoke the peaceful mediation or arbitration of the Sovereign Pontiff. Should we, could we, do so, if the authority of the Quirinal were sovereign and supreme in the Vatican?

They say that Leo XIII. is now arbitrating between the kings of Belgium and Portugal respecting the limits of the Congo State and the Portuguese possessions on the Dark Continent. No doubt the decision will be as prompt and as satisfactory as in the case of the Caroline Islands in 1885. But suppose the Pope to be under the control of the Italian Government, or that his present shadow of sovereignty were replaced by a real and effective dictation from the Quirinal, would either the Cabinet of Brussels or that of Lisbon have sought the intervention of the Holy See?

During the last few years, especially since Leo XIII. inaugurated his new and liberal policy in France,—the influence of the Roman Pontiffs in European affairs, and their interference, at a critical hour, with the interior policy of a great country like France, have been passionately discussed by the public press in every civilized country. In this discussion both Catholic and non-Catholic writers have, with a few exceptions, entirely ignored or lost sight of the grounds for such interference, and the lofty principles guiding the action of the Pontiffs, so often solemnly asserted and explained by Leo XIII. himself long before the memorable discourse of Cardinal Lavigerie, proclaiming the new policy recommended by the Vatican to the Catholics of France.

Whenever, in any Catholic country, it happens that the majority of the Catholic citizens or their leaders contract such an alliance with one or other of the dominant parties in that country as to threaten the most sacred interests of religion or to imperil the independence, the very existence, of the nation itself, it becomes the imperative duty of the Vicar of Christ to interfere.

If such be the necessity for the Popes, of the freedom which can alone spring from territorial sovereignty, when one considers the mere mediatorial office of the Head of the Church in international complications, how much more is that necessity in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creased when there is question of the Pope's uninterrupted, essential, and most sacred spiritual relations with every portion of his flock, and with the individual consciences which invoke his aid? Free intercourse with Rome was one of the inviolable privileges guaranteed to all peoples and to all individuals in past ages, not only by the universal consent of nations, but by the express and solemn dispositions of the Pontifical Decrees. Feudal despotism often interposed barriers and obstacles to this free communication with Rome. But the Popes fought energetically and consistently for their freedom of intercourse. Nor, whatever prejudice may have said and written to the contrary, were their motives inconsistent with the highest spiritual interests of the faithful flock.

Rome was the home of the Common Father. Men wearied with life's battle and labors loved to seek there repose and consolation. It was no foreign or strange land for the Christian of any clime. It was the natural home and refuge of the unfortunate. The Popes had been Sovereigns of Rome and of the Patrimony of St. Peter since at least the middle of the eighth century. Their sovereignty had been acknowledged by all the States of Christendom; it had been sanctioned—if a sanction were needed—by international law. No title among those of the potentates and governments of Europe could be compared in antiquity and universally admitted righteousness to that of the pontiff-kings. I say nothing, at present, of the incomparable services rendered by them to Italy, to Europe, to civilization. The territory thus guaranteed to them by the gratitude and the reverence of peoples and princes was the pledge and security of their independence of all foreign domination or dictation. That territorial and sovereign independence meant for the Common Father of Christendom—as he was regarded during all these centuries—absolute freedom in the discharge of his ministerial office.

It would be a most interesting and instructive study to search into the early annals of all civilized nations, and clearly establish on what right they hold possession of their respective territories, and what sanction they have for the exercise of sovereignty within the same. Few peoples can claim that they were the first to hold what constitutes their national domain, and they did not dispossess some prior occupant. So is it in the Old World: the right of con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quest, or superior might, is the title deed on which they hold their birthright. The feudalism on which was built the whole of the Christendom of our fathers owed its birth, growth, and long reign to the sword. Whatever it came, in the course of ages, to boast of in civilization, refinement, and morality, was due to the religion of Christ and the beneficent influence of its ministers. He would be a bold, nay, a reckless writer of European history who would deny to the Church of Rome, her pontiffs, and her missionaries, a great share of the results of the influence of Christianity upon society and its institutions.

As to the Papacy and the Papal States, they can fairly challenge the attention of the historian, the jurist, or the statesman to the legitimacy of their origin and the long admitted validity of their rights. More than one Protestant writer of celebrity has triumphantly vindicated the right of the Popes to the States of the Church, as well as to the gratitude of all Christion peoples. Even Gibbon, who had little love for the Christian religion and little admiration for the social edifice it created in Christendom, admits the growth of the moral influence exercised by the Bishops of Rome in every province and city of the empire, and under the emperors most hostile to the faith. After referring to the immense patrimony the Church had acquired and to the wise manner in which it was administered by the Popes, he says:

"The successor of St. Peter administered his patrimony with the temper of a vigilant and moderate landlord. . . . In the use of wealth he acted like a faithful steward of the Church and the poor, and liberally supplied to their wants the inexhaustible resources of abstinence and order."

As the empire fell into dissolution, the Papacy became more and more the great conservative and creative power. Witness the action of St. Gregory the Great (590–604). He was the living Providence of Italy, the true Father of all Christendom, the Apostle of England and Germany, and the Saviour of Spain from the terrible oppression of the Arian Visigoths. Read his vast correspondence, and you will be convinced that God never bestowed on the nations an institution more powerfully and peacefully beneficent than the Papacy. It was to save and to perpetuate in Papacy, the foster-parent of Christendom and of the civilization which began to flourish amid the ruins of the Roman Empire, that Pepin and Charlemagne sent their armies into Italy and won for the Popes that civil prin-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cipality which secured at once both their independence as Bishops of Rome and their freedom in the exercise of their pastorate as Vicars of Christ.

Compare with the rise and growth of this peaceful sovereignty of the Bishops of Rome the origin of all, or nearly all, the States of America, North and South. Beginning either in sheer violence, the brute force of the stronger, or in fraudulent compacts with the natives, never honestly kept, if ever intended to be so kept, time alone has sanctioned our possession of the land. But the length of this possession, which might constitute a proprietorship by prescription—what is it in comparison to the prescriptive right of the Papacy over the Patrimony of the Church? American nationalties are as of yesterday, compared to a civil principality dating from the middle of the eighth century of our era,—and whose universally acknowledged titles were the very centre of international jurisprudence and Christian order.

This liberty at bottom is the very same cause for which Leo XIII. is contending at this moment. But here comes in the supposition that the right of the Popes to any kind of a territorial sovereignty has been set aside once and forever by the establishment of the present Kingdom of Italy, and by its recognition by all the powers. Certain it is that the civil principality of the Pope has not been in the past detrimental to the prosperity, the greatness, the glory of Italy. No less certain is it that the policy of the Pontiffs, century after century, tended to foster the best interests of Italy, to establish, promote, and defend its independence against foreign domination. And it is equally certain that Leo XIII., like Pius IX. and Pius VI., has ever been in favor of a confederated Italy. Let us hear Italians themselves on this subject. Ugo Foscolo (1778–1827) has been much praised by both English and American publicists and *littérateurs*. We quote him here because the *Italianissimi* regard him as one of their very own. And yet here is what he writes about the necessity of maintaining in Italy the civil principality of the Popes:

"We Italians should be resolved—and resolved even to the shedding of the last drop of our blood—that the Pope Sovereign, the supreme guardian of the religion of Europe, an elective prince and an Italian, shall not only exist and reign, but reign ever in Italy for the defence of the Italians."

Of the venerable and illustrious Cantù, himself the greatest

* Cesare Cantù, *Caratteri Storici*, Milan, 1831, p. 350.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

living glory of Italy, and one of the martyrs of Italian independence, I shall quote no saying here. His whole life, his precious and numberless writings, have all been directed to one noble purpose—the freeing of the Italian peninsula from a foreign yoke, and the preservation therein of the religion of his forefathers. As in his writings, so in his splendid parliamentary career, Cantù was the eloquent and fearless defender of the Church against the Revolution—of the independence of the Papacy. He was the high priest of the Neo-Guelph party, which counted in its ranks Cesare Balbo and Massimo d'Azeglio. They had planned for Italy neither a centralized monarchy nor a centralized democracy, but the perfected ideal of the Lombard League of Free States—a confederation like our own, in which all the power and influence of the papacy would be used to secure the independence of the country against foreign domination, to promote and develop its internal prosperity, and to keep it at peace with all nations. This form of Italian unity is the very thing which Leo XIII. alluded to, as to his own cherished ideal, in the much-talked-of letter to Cardinal Rampolla, detailing his plan of conciliation with the Italian Government.

"It is usually put forward as an objection," the Pope writes, "that in order to restore the Pontifical Sovereignty, Italy must give up the great advantages she has already obtained; that no account must be had of modern progress, and that Italy must go back to the Middle Ages.

"But these are reasons which have no real weight.

"What is the advantage, true and substantial, to which the Pontifical Sovereignty would be opposed? It is most certain that the cities and territories formerly subject to the Civil Sovereignty of the Popes have ever been, in their character and manners, most distinctively Italian, and they have been preserved so, and kept from oftentimes falling beneath a foreign yoke, by the very fact of their belonging to the Popes. Nor could it be otherwise to-day. For, if, by reason of its lofty, universal, and perpetual mission, the Papacy belongs to all nations, on the other hand, because of the seat here assigned it by Providence, it is in a special manner one of the glories of Italy.

"Should such a restoration injure the oneness of the political state, we should, without entering on considerations touching the intrinsic merit of the case, and by simply placing ourselves on the standpoint of our adversaries, ask them whether or no this condition of unity constitutes, in itself, for nations a good so absolute that without it they can neither attain to prosperity nor greatness? Or is it a good of so transcendent a nature that it must be preferred to any other?

"We are answered in this by the fact that there exist most prosperous, powerful, and glorious nations who have not, and never have had, the kind of unity put forward here. Then natural reason furnishes a further answer, that in the conflict of pretensions it must give the preference to the rights of justice, which is the first foundation of the happiness and stability of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

states, and this preference must be still more emphasized when justice is inseparably conjoined with the highest interest of religion and of the universal church. In presence of this reason no hesitation is possible."*

Of course the reasons which most powerfully militate in favor of the restoration to the Pope of his territorial sovereignty, plead with equal force in favor of making Rome the seat of that sovereignty. Diplomatists, politicians, sovereigns even may talk of giving the Sovereign Pontiff a slice of territory in the Tyrol, some island in the Mediterranean or the Atlantic. But all such expedients are but wretched shifts. The Spaniards would have their own *Irredentisti* to claim back Majorca, if Spain gave it to-morrow in full sovereignty to Leo XIII. The project of creating a principality for him in the Tyrol would not guarantee the territory from the designs and incursions of the Italian *Irredentisti*. No civilized nation in our times is willing to part forever with a single foot of its soil, even to secure a home for the Pope. And no matter where the nations of both hemispheres might agree to create a civil principality for him; to "neutralize" it, and take it under the protection of international law, would this changeable agency we call diplomacy, or international law and policy, be more powerful to-morrow and the day after to defend the right of the Pontiffs in their new home, than they were yesterday in saving Rome and the States of the Church from the ambition of Piedmont and the fanatical hatred of the anti-Christian Revolution? And to what corner of the globe, to what city in any land, would the vicar of Christ have a right so unquestioned and so universally recognized as to the city of Rome and the territory of which it was the capital less than twenty-five years ago?

The convention of September 14, 1864, solemnly bound King Victor Emmanuel and his ministers to respect the Sovereignty of the Pope, and to protect his territory against invasion.

"But," says Cantù, "when some legislators spoke in the Chamber of Italian Deputies of invading the Pontifical State, Venosta, Minister of Foreign Affairs, declared that they (of the kingdom of Italy) were bound by a responsibility from which even the States of Barbary would not hold themselves absolved. He acknowledged the obligation under which they lay of not attacking, and permitting no one to attack, the Pontifical frontier, because they were in this bound by the ordinary sanctions and rules of the law of nations. Besides this, Lanza, the Italian Prime Minister, said to the Chamber: 'Do you think, gentlemen, that it is a prudent step to come to

*Acta Sanctæ Sedis, vol. xx.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this chamber and to incite the government to take possession of a state acknowledged by all the powers of Europe, and to occupy it without any one of the motives ordinarily regarded as legitimate?'"*

Thiers, who never was a Catholic, but was a true statesman, thus described in 1865, in a discourse before the French legislature, what the Italian revolutionists were plotting:

"What will happen when we shall have seen the revolution they are bringing about in Italy fully consummated? They will compel the Pope to come down from his throne, and then the central authority in the Church will be destroyed. People go on repeating that the Pope, once he has been dethroned, will remain independent. In my judgment, he will then cease to be free. No nation will accept the authority of Rome once that authority has become, or is supposed to be, dependent. The unity of the commanding spiritual power will be destroyed. Its fragments will be transferred by Spain to Toledo, by France to Paris, by Austria to Prague or Gratz, or it may be to Vienna." †

Nor should we Americans—to borrow a parallel illustration from our political order—wish, for a kindred reason, to see New York, for instance, become in the year of grace 1894 or '95 the seat of the Federal Government, with Congress, the Supreme Court of the United States, and all the departments of our vast administration transferred to Manhattan Island. And here it is that we ask American readers, non-Catholic readers especially, to lay aside for the moment their preconceived notions about Papal Rome and to examine the claims set forth by Leo XIII. and supported by the entire Church of which he is the head, in the light of common justice and common-sense. Rome is unlike any other city. It is, and has been since Christianity began, the seat, the ordinary residence of the Bishops of Rome. Give it back to them, and let them be, more than ever in the coming era, the teachers, the guides, the shepherds, and parents of our humanity.

BERNARD O'REILLY.

* Cesare Cantù, *Storia di Trent Anni*, c. viii.
† Quoted by Cantù, *Storia di Trent Ultimé Anni*, c. viii.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CUSTOMS ADMINISTRATIVE ACT.

BY THE HON. CHARLES S. HAMLIN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

THE Democratic party is charged with the grave responsibility of effecting a thcrough revision of the existing customs tariff, to the end that the burdens of taxation, rendered even more severe by the McKinley bill, may be lightened. The latter bill, however, was not the only legislation of the Fifty-first Congress which involved a new departure in customs matters; the passage of the customs administrative act * so radically changed existing methods of administration that, temporarily at least, it caused in the mercantile world as great annoyance as did the McKinley bill, extreme as that measure was. It will be found, however, upon consideration, that there are certain underlying principles beneath its harsh exterior which are a decided advance over the old system, and which, amended as in the report of the Ways and Means Committee of the existing Congress, will insure a more uniform, speedy, and equitable system of collecting revenue than we have ever hitherto enjoyed.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, there was imported into the United States dutiable merchandise to the value of over four hundred millions of dollars; the taxes levied by law upon this merchandise aggregated over two hundred millions of dollars. This vast sum was collected by the customs officials at the respective custom-houses, one hundred and twenty-four in number, throughout the country, by means of customs duties.

There are three modes of assessing these taxes provided for by law: 1. Upon the weight, measurement, or gauge of the merchandise, called specific duties; about five hundred men are

* U. S. Statutes at Large, Vol. 26, page 131.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yearly employed for this purpose at a cost to the government of nearly half a million dollars yearly. 2. Upon the value of the merchandise, known as *ad-valorem* duties; ascertainment of this value gives employment yearly to about seven hundred men, at a cost to the government of $900,000. 3. Upon weight or measurement and upon value, known as mixed duties. The total cost to the government of collecting these taxes is not far from seven million dollars annually.

One marked difference exists between specific and *ad-valorem* duties. In the former, duties are assessed upon the weight, measurement, or gauge of the merchandise as found in the United States at the time of entry. In the latter, the value for dutiable purposes is not the value in the United States markets nor at the time of entry; it is the value of the merchandise in the principal markets of the country from whence imported at the time of exportation from said country.

The Constitution prescribes that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"; but a law uniform as to rates of duty may receive the widest diversity of interpretation at the different ports of entry. If all duties were specific, such diversity could not well exist, for we have the same standard of weight and measurement, and such weight or measurement would not materially differ between the time of shipment and arrival in this country.

Specific or mixed duties, however, are open to the grave objection that they bear unequally upon different grades of goods of similar kinds: for example, upon certain grades of worsted the duty of forty-four cents per pound and 50 per cent. amounts to a net duty, reduced to *ad valorem*, of over 112 per cent. upon the grade costing forty-eight cents per yard, while upon the dearer goods costing one dollar and sixty-two cents the duty amounts only to 68 per cent.

Thus where there are appreciable differences in quality of merchandise, the specific duty is objectionable.

Upon most imported articles it is believed that the *ad-valorem* duty is the most equitable, bearing with perfect fairness upon all goods of similar kind and disclosing by its very terms the exact amount of tax levied. The policy of the Democratic party has been from earliest times to substitute *ad-valorem* for specific duties; notable instances are the Walker Tariff of 1846, wholly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ad-valorem, and the Wilson bill, just reported, containing more *ad-valorem* duties than any legislation of this generation.*

The fact that the question of value to be determined is foreign, not home, value, and that the time is that of shipment, and not arrival, has in the past given rise to much difference of opinion as to value, and hence to wide variations in the amount of duty collected upon similar goods at the respective ports of entry.

The principal problem of customs administration is to insure correct determination of value and uniform interpretation of the law. This problem becomes to-day of the most vital importance to the Democratic party. Congress, true to the pledges made to the people, will reduce taxation; an enormous revenue must still be collected for the maintenance of the government by this same means of taxation; the rate being lowered, it is imperative that this lower rate be rigidly and uniformly collected; otherwise we shall suffer loss of revenue, which we can ill afford, and the honest merchant will be ruined by the successful evasion of the law by his dishonest rival.

To appreciate fully the changes in administration brought about by the customs administrative act, it will be necessary briefly to consider what the old law was as regards the two principal questions which arise in customs administration: 1. Classification. 2. Value. 1. Classification consists in determining under what clause of the tariff law an imported article of merchandise comes. The collector classifies all goods, in the first instance, both under the old and new law, and many difficult questions come up for his decision; for example, whether or not imported tiles can come under the classification of "paving tiles," thereby paying a much lower rate of duty than under the general head of "earthenware." † Under the old law the importer could appeal to the Secretrry of the Treasury from the collector's decision as to classification, and finally could bring an action at law against the collector to recover the excess of duties wrongly levied; in that suit he could have a trial by jury upon the questions of fact involved in the case. 2. The value of all goods imported into the United States is determined, in the first instance, under both the old and new

* The present law contains 129 *ad-valorem*, 260 specific, and 56 mixed duties; the Wilson Bill, as reported, contains 240 *ad-valorem*, 97 specific, and 15 mixed duties. This comparison is, it is believed, substantially accurate.

† Rossman v. Hedden (145 U. S., 561).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system, by the local appraisers; where the duties are specific, the value is of use only for statistical purposes. Under the old law the collector could order a reappraisal by the local appraisers or by three merchants appointed by him for that purpose, if he thought the valuation was too low; if the importer was dissatisfied with the valuation, the collector called in some merchant to act with one of the general appraisers* and reappraise the goods; or if it was not practicable to secure the services of one of the general appraisers, the collector chose two merchants for such reappraisal. † If the merchant and the general appraiser or the two merchants could not agree, the collector of the port finally determined the value of the goods; there was no appeal from this decision.

Under the present customs administrative act a board of nine customs experts is constituted, known as the Board of General Appraisers. All questions of dutiable value are referred to one of their number on appeal from the local appraiser, and their decision on appeal, sitting as a full board of three, is final. The collector no longer has any part in determining such dutiable value.

Appeals upon questions of classification from the decision of the collector to the Secretary of the Treasury are also done away with under the new law, and instead an appeal is allowed to the Board of General Appraisers; from its decision an appeal lies to the Circuit Court of the United States.

The advantage of having an impartial board for determining customs questions becomes manifest when it is considered that the dutiable value of imported goods to be determined is their value not at the port of entry, but at the place from which they are exported, perhaps thousands of miles away. At the place of exportation, the various conditions of manufacture, such as cost of materials, hours of work, etc., may be widely different from the conditions prevailing in this country, and therefore the judgment of trained experts is practically essential in determining this foreign value

Under the old law there often existed wide differences as to the results in the determination of the foreign value of similar kinds of imported goods by merchant appraisers at different ports

* The functions of these so-called general appraisers were entirely different from those of the present board; they supervised reappraisements merely.

† Hence the name popularly given to the old system: The Merchant Appraiser System.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in this country. In one port the actual transaction might be held decisive as to tne foreign value; in another, an entirely different rule might be established. In case the merchant and the government appraiser disagreed, the foreign value was finally adjudicated by the collector—in many cases not a customs expert at all, but merely a public personage, appointed largely because of his political rather than his business prominence in the community, and having no special experience in such matters.

The functions of the Board of General Appraisers under the present law are those of a jury of experts. The board is composed of lawyers and customs experts, holding office for life; under a new tariff, in which *ad-valorem* duties will largely be substituted for specific duties, some such board is essential to the proper collection of the revenue needed for the support of the government.

The principal objections which have been raised to the present law are :

1. The right of trial by jury has been taken away from the importer. It must be remembered that trial by jury has never been allowed upon questions of value; the present Board of General Appraisers constitutes in effect a jury of experts, who have had wide experience in determining such questions. Upon classification the loss of trial by jury, it is believed, has been more than compensated for by the speedier and more equitable determination of litigated questions at the hands of men whose sole business it is to familiarize themselves with such matters.

2. The existing system of trial of facts as well as law in the Circuit Court on appeal from the Board of General Appraisers on questions of classification is unsatisfactory and of no more value than a single trial. This objection is founded upon the fact that the Circuit Court in reviewing a case usually has to decide it on evidence not before the Board of Appraisers, and upon the further fact that the court in receiving the record from the board does not receive the most valuable part, viz., the expert knowledge on which the board presumably in part bases its decisions. How this objection can be rescinded will be considered later.

3. The government can appeal to the Circuit Court of Appeals on questions of law in any case; this right is allowed the importer only where the Circuit Court adjudges that the question is of such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

importance as would warrant an appeal. This objectionable feature of the law can be and should be at once changed.

4. The existing law, in determining dutiable value, prescribes that the value of all crates, sacks, coverings, and boxes in which merchandise subject to *ad-valorem* duty is stored shall be added to the dutiable value of the contents, thus increasing the net duty. This provision, amounting to an average increase in duty of from three to five per cent., was law prior to the tariff act of 1883, which repealed all duties levied upon coverings. The existing law was favored by Secretaries Folger, Manning, and Fairchild. The principal reasons for levying a duty upon such coverings are prevention of fraud and saving of labor. If appraisers had to determine the value of foreign goods without any coverings they would have to separate such value from their total value as usually found in the market; under the tariff of 1883 they could not include the value of a barrel containing cement, but had to separate the value of the barrel from the value of the contents. This provision caused much trouble and confusion, and also, it is alleged, much fraud. Such reasoning, however, may not apply to outer coverings used merely for the goods in transit, and it is upon such coverings that the hardship of levying a duty is most felt. The chief objection, however, to levying such duty is that it increases thereby the net duty. This can easily be met by lowering the rate on the goods themselves.

5. In case the value, as fixed by the appraisers, exceeds the value entered by the importer by more than 10 per cent., a penal duty of two per cent. on the appraised value, in addition to the corrected legal duty, is levied for every 1 per cent. such appraised value exceeds the value declared in the entry. This penalty is altogether too stringent. In a case now pending before the Treasury Department the appraised value was $12.50, the corrected duties $3.13, while the penal duty was $2,100!

6. The importer is not allowed, as of right, to be present when the Board of Appraisers takes testimony as to value or classification. By courtesy importers have always been allowed to have a hearing before the board, and to offer such evidence as they desire. This much should certainly be secured to them by law. But it would be manifestly unwise to limit the Board of Appraisers in deciding a case to such evidence as is submitted to it without allowing the members to use their expert knowledge.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Such a rule would change an appraisal to a lawsuit—which is manifestly not what is contemplated by the law.

7. If judgment is rendered by the courts in favor of the importer upon an appeal, the excess of duties is refunded without allowance of interest or costs. Under the old procedure, suit was brought against the collector to recover duties illegally assessed. Being a private suit the judgment against the collector included interest and costs. Under Revised Statutes U. S., Sec. 988, the judgment, including interest and costs, was paid by the government. It was held by the United States Circuit Court of Massachusetts that the procedure offered by the customs administrative act, was in effect a suit against the United States, and that, as the act made no provision for interest or costs, none could be recovered. A contrary decision has lately been rendered in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals. It is reasoned, by those who are opposed to allowing interest, that, inasmuch as, in most cases at least, the importer receives back the duty paid in the price paid by the consumer, the final refund allowed to the importer by the courts is in the nature of a gratuity to pay interest upon which the consumer should not again be taxed.

8. The present law repeals all damage allowance upon goods in transit. Under the old law, when imported goods were found to be damaged, due allowance was made in assessing duties, but so many attempts at fraud were discovered that all damage allowance was repealed. The Wilson bill, as hereinafter shown, gives a modified damage allowance. The Wilson Bill, it is believed, has remedied the most important defects of the present law, leaving the administrative laws more effective than ever before. Under the provisions of the Wilson bill the existing Board of General Appraisers is retained, and its jurisdiction as to all questions of fact is made final, both as to classification and value. Appeals to the Circuit Court are done away with, and in place thereof an appeal lies on all questions of law directly to the Circuit Court of Appeals. Hearings are provided for on all questions of classification, and are made public. The severe penal duty has been greatly modified by the provision that an extra duty equal to the regular rates shall be charged on all advances over the entered value. Outer coverings used solely for transportation of goods to this country are exempted from duty, and a modified damage allowance is provided for in cases

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where imported merchandise is injured or destroyed while in custody of the government. It is also provided that customs brokers hereafter shall be licensed by the collectors of the respective ports before doing business at custom-houses, which licenses may be revoked for cause by the Secretary of the Treasury. Certain other provisions bring the Board of General Appraisers more within the control of the Secretary of the Treasury as to all matters not strictly delegated to the Board by Congress.

Perhaps the most important administrative change in the Wilson bill is Section 9, creating the necessary machinery and providing that materials may be imported free of duty for manufacture of articles for exportation. To obtain the benefits of this section the various factories will be constituted bonded warehouses and the manufacture will take place under customs supervision. It is believed that this law will soon make our country the manufacturing center of the world; it will demonstrate that the higher wages paid our workingmen are the measure of their superiority, not their inferiority, over foreign labor, and it will furnish an impressive object-lesson of tariff reform.

The work of Congress will not be complete until it has amended the existing law on the lines of the Wilson bill. Under the law so amended it will be possible to import goods directly from foreign manufacturers, and to enter such goods at any port with the certainty that the duties will be uniformly assessed, no one port being favored at the expense of another. Such uniformity could not be attained under the old system.

The new law with the proposed amendments will enormously extend our markets; it will be simple where the old law was intricate; it will be uniform where the old law was hopelessly complex. Such uniformity is essential to the autonomy of the respective ports of entry; fraud will be minimized, and merchants will stand upon complete equality.

The mission of the Democratic party, among others, is to demonstrate that genuine tariff reform as contained in the Wilson bill will be of the greatest benefit to our whole people. The customs administrative act as amended, insuring uniform enforcement of the new tariff and doing away with fraudulent undervaluation, will greatly assist in that demonstration.

CHARLES SUMNER HAMLIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EVILS OF EARLY MARRIAGES.

BY CYRUS EDSON, M. D., HEALTH COMMISSIONER OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

THE evil effect of early marriages, first on the mothers, and second on the offspring, is beginning to attract the attention of scientific men in many parts of the world. It is only within the last hundred years that people have understood the value of statistics, and have learned how to keep them. It was formerly believed that it was impossible to predicate, with any certainty, anything about men and women, because the impossibility of knowing beforehand what any individual would do was apparent. We have found, however, while this remains true of the individual, that a number of persons will act in precisely the same way, and that we can prophesy for the mass without fear of failure.

The value of statistics, though great in sociological matters, is yet greater in those which affect the health or life. While it is true that we cannot say of any one man when he will die, we can with perfect confidence say what proportion of a thousand men of the same age will have died ten years from now. More than this, we can declare almost absolutely what percentage of a thousand babies will have measles or croup. In the same way, we can tell beforehand what effect on those children certain known acts in the lives of the parents will have. Given men and women who have been exposed to certain influences on the health, as, for example, living in crowded tenement-houses, and we can say what will be the diseases which the children of those men and women will develop.

There are certain inherited abnormal tendencies, just as there are certain inherited diseases. By tendencies I mean conditions of mind and body, that manifest themselves in physical and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mental deficiencies. These, as a rule, come from the mother's side. If the mother be not fully developed and her character not fully formed at the time of the birth of her child, the latter will in all probability never be capable of full development. It will be a weakling, morally and physically. It has long been a recognized fact, even among the people at large, that the children of older parents are wiser and better than those of youthful parents.

Child-bearing is one of the most severe drains on strength of which we have any knowledge; and for this, nature stores up in the mother a very great amount of reserve strength. Not only this, but the girl will, if she be in good health, accumulate much greater latent energy and strength than will her brother. It may be easily understood, however, that this accumulation is not made until after the girl has had her growth, because, up to that time, she must not only satisfy the daily need of strength, but she must also provide the material for growth. As the majority of girls cease to grow after they are seventeen, it is from this age on that this storing up of the reserve strength which will enable them to undergo the physical strain of motherhood takes place. Consequently, it is apparent that when a girl is married before the reserve has been gathered, she is called on to meet the physical strain without the necessary force. This can only result in one way, because the draught of the growing offspring on her strength will not be denied. Strength that is vital to her being is drawn on, and she is sacrificed in order that her child may be born.

The only career open to girls in European countries for many centuries has been marriage. The father has supported his daughters until they have become women, and has then expected them to marry into homes of their own. As a matter of course, since it is the function of the majority of women in this world to bear children, this demand then made that these girls should marry has had nothing unnatural about it; it has been the result of a natural law. But it brought with it the feeling that the girls must marry, no matter whether they wished to do so or not. It created for them one ideal—marriage; it logically attached a stigma to the title of "old maid," and, with equal logic, made it, not exactly disgraceful, but certainly "bad form," for a girl to do anything to support herself. To further intensify the latter feeling, the pressure of overpopulation played its part. In homely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

words, there was not work enough for the boys and girls both, and the boys were believed to have the first claim on what there was. In return for this, they were expected to support the half that did not work for the daily bread. Of course, in their homes and in the care of their children, the women did their full share of the labor. But the fact remained that they were not allowed to work in any other way.

It is not a little amusing, although it is perfectly natural, to find that Mr. Walter Besant, in his articles on this country, has applied those laws or natural rules under which he has lived his life, to affairs as he sees them here. He laments the freedom of American girls to enter the field of labor and to compete with men, and he points out as what he believes will be the result, that the men will be debarred from working. It is probably not possible for Mr. Besant to understand that the natural resources of the United States have not yet seen one-tenth of their development, and that in this country there is work, therefore, for many times the population we have. In point of fact, it is the demand for labor, the demand for more hands and brains to do the work, that has opened all fields of industry in America to women. The enfranchisement of these women is due primarily to the need for more people to do the ever-increasing mass of work. It must not be forgotten that we have forces under our control to-day which enable us to wrest far more from the natural resources of the country and to utilize the raw material to an extent and in a way that the world has never seen before. While these forces have more than doubled the effectiveness of each human being, they have perhaps more than quadrupled the possible result to be derived from his efforts.

As a consequence, the women of this country, having been enfranchised and being to-day at liberty to support themselves, even as their brothers may, it is but natural that this freedom should reflect itself in the marriage statistics. An American girl need feel herself neither disgraced, nor a burden to others, if she elect not to marry ; she has the right to labor and to earn her own living. She is therefore free to choose her line in life.

Now, it is a fact that nature is very conservative, and that she will guard a man or woman carefully. If there be no outside pressure of any kind, and if human beings are left to themselves, they will not undertake tasks which are too great for them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is effected by what we call instinct, because it is rarely that persons acting under its dictates are able to give any reason for it. Generally speaking, they are incapable of analyzing the motives from which they act; they do not understand that the disinclination they have for a certain proposed course is really but the expression of an instinct given them by nature for their preservation. It is said the camel will not attempt to rise if the burden be too great; but so far as we know, there is no record of any camel having given any reasons for sleeping on the ground. Quite as dumb are those girls who refuse to marry because they prefer their liberty.

The pressure of American life on one and all of us is very great. There is a drive, a bustle, an ever-anxious effort to keep up with the procession, to get through the mass of work which is before us. The society in which we live is based on excitement; the tax it puts on our nerves and brains is of the greatest. Women feel this even more than men, and they show the effects in the constantly increasing amount of nervous diseases to be found among them. With men and women driven in this way, the children are born with a predisposition to nervousness. Under our system of educating them, this tendency is stimulated to the utmost.

We have, then, in this country as factors in the problem of early marriages, a problem which is taxing some of the wisest brains across the water: First, the overwork put on the girls during their years in school; second, the fact that they are free to marry or not, as they see fit. This latter follows on the two facts: that they are at liberty to support themselves, and that there is no stigma on them if they remain single. If we will place these two factors in conjunction with that instinct of self-preservation which nature implants in all of us, we should expect to find early marriages among American women not to be the rule.

The statistics on this point which I find available are worthy of special study:

STATISTICS OF MARRIAGES IN NEW YORK CITY.

	1891.	1892.
Average age of grooms (years)	28.82	28.89
" " brides "	24.59	24.43
Number of grooms under 20 years of age	120	145
" brides " " "	2,839	2,959
Age at which there was greatest number of grooms (years)	25.29	25.29
" " " " next greatest number of grooms (years)	21.24	21.24
" " " " greatest number of brides (years)	21.24	21.24
" " " " next greatest number of brides (years)	25.29	25.29
Total number of marriages	15,764	16,001

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The evil of early marriages in Europe, showing itself, as it does, in the health of the children, has engaged the attention of many scientific men. In a discussion before the London Diocesan Conference, it was declared as the unanimous opinion of that body that the evil of early marriages has grown to such an extent as to render some reform in the marriage laws urgently necessary. Subsequently, at the Congress of Hygiene, Dr. Korosi, of Buda-Pesth, read a paper on "The Influence of the Age of Parents on the Vitality of Their Children," containing remarkable statements in line with the above declaration. He showed, from a comparison of several thousand cases, that the proportion of deaths among children from weakly constitutions or maladies traceable to the mother was twice as large among the children of mothers under twenty as among the children of mothers over thirty. Investigation also showed that the healthiest offspring was born of mothers between twenty and thirty, united to husbands between thirty and forty; where either husband or wife was under twenty, the offspring proved generally weakly, this being the case, even in Hungary, where the girls become women at the age of thirteen. In that country, too, fifteen per cent. of the number of marriages shows the brides to be under twenty years of age, and in England twelve per cent.

It may be safely said that this evil does not exist in this country, at least to anything like the same extent among the American-born women. The reason is plain: we have removed the necessity which exists among foreign girls of marrying in order to be supported; and although the girls here are practically free to marry when they please, the instinct of self-preservation has guarded them well. They feel when very young they are not strong enough, and they instinctively or wisely wait until the time when they will be stronger. The remedy for the evil abroad would properly be to allow the girls to support themselves, to remove from them the reproach of not marrying, and then to trust to their instinct to guard the health of themselves and their offspring. Unfortunately, this remedy is one which time alone can bring to them.

CYRUS EDSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WILSON BILL.

BY SENATOR ROGER Q. MILLS, OF TEXAS.

THE annual expenditures of the Government, including the amount required for the sinking-fund, demand of the Treasury $500,000,000. In preparing any measure to raise that sum by taxation, two objects ought to be kept steadily before the eye of the legislator. One object should be so to lay the burden as that each citizen shall be required to contribute his just share to the support of the government. And the other is that as far as it can possibly be done the revenue should be raised without obstructing or hindering the movement of the products of labor on their way to market, so that they may find ready sale and our labor find constant and remunerative employment.

The Democratic party, now in possession of the executive and legislative branches of the government, has, from its origin, been the advocate and defender of equal rights and equal duties. It has been the uncompromising foe of class legislation and special privileges. In the press, on the stump, and in conventions it has condemned every form of legislation that conferred bounties and exclusive privileges on one class of people and corresponding burdens on another. Two years ago the people took us at our word and placed in our hands the constitutional power to redeem the pledges we had so often made. We are now face to face with the responsibility, and the future is soon to tell whether we have been sincere in the professions we have made and whether we have the ability to execute the trust confided to our hands.

Of all the objects which make the institution of government necessary, none is so important as the security of property. We often speak of the security to life and liberty as though nothing else was imperilled by lawless force. But the security of the person can be more easily maintained and defended than can the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

security of property. There is no right so easily invaded as the right of property, and, when invaded, so difficult to defend. There is little motive to incite even the most hardened reprobate to do violence to the person of another. Malice in exceptional cases stimulates to the perpetration of personal injury, but a desire to deprive another of his property is widespread, and so potent is that criminal inclination that there could be no security for property except within the jurisdiction of organized force. The institution of government is indispensable to its existence, and, being so, it is just that each person embraced within the compacts of government should contribute to its support in proportion as the government supports him in the enjoyment of his property.

When men associate in ordinary business enterprises, they do so upon the principle that each is to pay toward the expenses and receive of the profits according to the capital he has invested. If two men purchase a vessel and engage in the carrying trade, and one puts in $100,000 and the other $500,000, the latter pays five times as much of the expenses incurred and receives five times as much of the profits earned. I doubt if it ever entered the brain of any sane man to organize and conduct a private business on any other principle. It is difficult to see why a different rate should be adopted in the organization of government. Equality in the enjoyment of all rights, and in bearing all burdens is the bed-rock principle of free government. The Democratic party promised the country that when it came into power it would institute a just system of taxation; and when it begins the work it is confronted within its own lines by a determined opposition to the execution of its promises. It is charged vehemently that a tax on wealth is odious and inquisitorial. If that be true, all state and local systems of taxation are of the same hateful nature, and have been so from the beginning of the government. All taxes are odious to the taxpayer, and they become more so in proportion to the size of the contribution. But after all, they must be imposed and paid, and every citizen should willingly share in their contribution. How are the $500,000,000 to be raised? Is the whole burden to be laid upon articles produced by the annual labor of the people, and the consumption of which is required year by year to sustain human life? Is all accumulated wealth to be exempt? Land cannot be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reached, because the Constitution has placed it beyond the power of Congress. But there are abundant means within our reach from which we may gather the required sum without destroying our commerce and shutting out our labor from employment. We have between sixty-five and seventy billions of acccumulated wealth, whose annual gain and income may justly be required to aid in supporting the government. We produce over eight billions of manufactured product protected against competition : it would not be unjust to call on it for a contribution. We have many millions deposited in banks which the government is guarding for its owners. There can be no good reason why these millions should not be taxed. We have ten thousand millions of railroad property which the government is protecting, but for that protection that property is contributing nothing. It should be called upon by the tax-gatherer. Adam Smith lays down the canon that

"the subjects of *every state* ought to contribute toward the support of the government, as nearly as possible, in proportion to their respective abilities ; that is, in proportion to the rsvenues which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the state."

This canon is correct both morally and legally, and it should be rigorously observed by the legislator in laying upon the shoulders of the citizen the exactions of government. But we have reversed the principle, and instead of laying the duties in proportion to what the taxpayer has, we lay it in proportion to what he has not. We do not " take out and keep out " as little as possible, as Smith admonishes us, but as much as possible. And we tax him, not only for the support of the state, but for the support of indigent millionaires. This policy must be reversed and the change must be made by the existing Congress. The bill reported by the Committee of Ways and Means has inaugurated the work, and it must be prosecuted to success. It has been criticised and denounced by those who are receiving the benefits of the existing system. The objections made by them are utterly destitute of merit. The tax proposed on incomes is but a light touch on the monumental piles of wealth, for the protection of which the government is standing guard. A just contribution would go much beyond the limit prescribed by the committee. Great Britain collects seventy millions of dollars on the incomes of her thirty millions of people, and we are not proposing to exact one-half that sum from over sixty-eight millions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be impossible now to pass the bill with that feature and it may be eliminated from its provisions. But the time will come when that measure will be placed upon the statute-books, and when it is it will be much more exacting than the one now proposed. If the wealthy classes would consult the book of wisdom they would have their representatives tender it and cheerfully support it. To antagonize it, and persist in demanding the retention of a system so grossly unjust that it is prostrating the labor of the nation, is to defy all the fates at once. The schoolmaster is abroad in the land, and the masses are awakening to a consciousness of their rights and to a realization of their wrongs. They are beginning to feel their power, and they will organize and attack these abuses, and when they shall have finished their work there will be nothing left to be desired. The nobility of France, before the French Revolution, persistently refused to bear any of the burden of taxation to support the government. The revenues were running down, and the backs of the peasantry were breaking under the load. The States-General were summoned, and the nobles were implored to give their consent to share with the commons the burdens of supporting the government; but to every appeal they defiantly answered "No." The result was an upheaval in which they lost all their wealth, and with it their rank and station in the state. One thing may as well be accepted now as at any other time. The present system of taxation will not and can not be endured. The contest now on will continue till it is torn out root and branch. The controversy will be settled only when it is settled right.

The question recurs, How are we to raise the five hundred millions? The committee has answered by proposing to increase the internal-revenue tax. The step proposed is right, but it is not long enough. The field of internal taxation is a very inviting one. To say nothing of new subjects, those now bearing taxes can be called on for more revenues without burdening the consumers. The Wilson bill may be criticised, because it does not go far enough in the line of readjustment and reform, but no fair-minded man can attack it because it goes too far. With the proposed duty on imported spirits of two dollars per gallon, the internal tax could easily have been increased to one dollar and twenty cents a gallon. The increase of ten cents per gallon is too moderate with a deficiency staring us in the face. The existing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duty on foreign spirits gives a protection to the domestic distiller of 177 per cent., and the committee proposes to reduce that to 155 per cent. If protection against competition is justifiable on any article of commerce, it is not on whiskey. There can be no reason for building up that home industry. In taxing all alcoholic beverages, we should hold steadily to the revenue principle. If the exigencies of government demand a tax of a dollar and twenty cents per gallon on the domestic product, precisely the same rate should be fixed on the imported article. As it is, we obtain scarcely any revenues by import duties. The small domestic producers have been crushed out by the law, and the few large ones have combined and put up, and keep up, the price so high that the consumption of the duty-paid article is arrested, smuggling and moonshining are increased, and the revenues to the government decreased.

The wealth of the distillers is greatly enhanced by reason of this excessive protection. A tax of one dollar and twenty cents per gallon would greatly increase the revenues from spirits, and it would all be taken from that sum which the government has deposited in the pockets of the distillers. A tax on spirits at that rate would bring to the treasury $115,000,000. The same course should be pursued with reference to beer. Our internal tax is ninety-three cents per barrel of thirty-one gallons, or three cents per gallon. The duty on imported beer is forty cents per gallon. The protection to the home industry is more than a thousand per cent. There can be no good reason why this should be, but very good reasons why it should not be. The high duty on foreign beer practically prohibits all importation. We get no revenue from imported beer, and the only effect of the duty is to protect the American brewer against competition, while he fixes the price to the consumer as high as the traffic will bear. The tax on beer should be increased to six cents per gallon for the producer at home, and the imported beer should be rated at the same figure. The price to the consumer would then be lowered on both foreign and domestic beer, while the revenues from the domestic product would be increased from thirty-two to sixty-four millions. Distilling whiskey and brewing beer are monopolies created by law, and the government can justly claim a large share of the revenues which it has carried to the pockets of the beneficiaries.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The tax of $3 per thousand on cigars and cigarettes brought to the treasury last year $14,442,591. The internal taxes on cigars and tobacco are like those imposed on spirits and beer. They have created monopolies, and the government can increase its demands upon them without burdening the people. The duty on cigars imported into the United States is $4.50 per pound and 25 per cent. on their value. They are subject also to the $3 internal tax. The internal tax of $3 is paid on twelve pounds or its equivalent of one thousand in number. The specific tax amounts to $54. The average value of the cigars imported last year was $4.48 per pound, and the thousand cost $53.76. The *ad-valorem* duty, therefore, was $13.44. The total specific, *ad-valorem*, and internal taxes paid by the thousand imported cigars amounted to $70.44. This high duty is to protect the domestic cigarmaker, who has a monopoly and pays the government $3 for it. The duty keeps out all low-priced cigars that would come in and pay revenue and lower the price to consumers. Under this duty none but the highest quality can be imported. The machinery of the internal-revenue system makes competition by small cigarmakers impossible, and the large ones combiue and make the market price at their own will. The limit of that price is fixed by their capacity to extort from the trade. If the duty on the imported cigars were laid by value at a revenue rate, the importation of all classes would be increased and the government and people would both be benefited. Then if the internal tax were doubled, the Treasury would receive double the amount of revenue. The cigars upon which the domestic producer pays $3 tax costs him less than $10 per thousand tax paid, and he sells them for two and three times that amount. The internal tax could be easily raised to $6 per thousand without adding a cent to the price of the cigars in the market. The import duty on leaf and manufactured tobacco is another exercise of the taxing power for the purpose of strangulation instead of revenue. The duty on the imported leaf is $2.75 per pound, and under the existing tariff we imported 6½ pounds last year, from which our treasury received the sum of $17.38. We have no internal tax on leaf tobacco, and the duty on the imported article is a prohibition against importation and against revenue. One quality of leaf tobacco, not suited for cigar wrappers, is dutiable at 35 cents per pound, and the revenue from its impor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tation last year amounted to $5,712,762. This duty was equivalent to 82 per cent. *ad valorem*. A duty of 30 per cent. on all classes of imported tobacco would double the revenues from that article; and doubling the internal taxes on cigars, cigarettes, and manufactured tobacco would double the revenues received from the domestic product. The bill of the committee has been constructed on these lines, but it should have gone much further. To sum up, an internal tax of $1.20 per gallon on spirits would give us $115,000,000. A tax of six cents per gallon on beer would give us at least $60,000,000. Doubling the internal rate on cigars, cigarettes, and manufactured tobacco would give us $60,000,000, and an income tax of $15,000,000 would make $250,000,000 from internal taxation. We may rely on $100,000,000 in round numbers from postal revenues and miscellaneous sources. Now we must raise $150,000,000 from customs.

In approaching the subject, the first thought that rises in the mind is how to deal with our imports so as to guard against inflicting injury upon our labor. The constant employment of our labor at the best possible rate of wages is a consideration of incalculable importance, and must dwarf all others and remain uppermost in the mind of the legislator. Any act of legislation that obstructs or hinders the movement of the products of labor as they go from producer to consumer restricts consumption, both foreign and domestic; and the act which restricts consumption restricts production, lessens the demand for employment, and minimizes the earnings of labor.

In the unhappy condition of our country to-day—a condition which, in a great measure, is the logical result of this very evil—our statesmen, instead of defending these abuses, should bend every energy of mind and muscle to find employment for every one of our idle workmen. Public works, wherever they are to be constructed, should be entered upon now, and the most liberal appropriations should be made for their continuance: instead of discharging one person from government employ, two should be taken on. This course should be pursued by national, State, and local authorities. Instead of fencing in the genius and skill of our laborers, we should throw wide the gateways and permit them to enter every market and successfully compete with all rivals. Every obstruction should be swept out of the way of our products as they go to seek markets for their consumption. In

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the inauguration of this policy, the very first step to take is to put *all* materials that are to be manufactured or remanufactured on the free list. The work must not stop with wool and coal and ores, but it must be extended to all materials.

In looking at the schedules, the first in the list is chemicals, every article of which should be placed on the free list. Almost every article on that schedule is used in our metal and textile manufactures. In the metal schedule, all ores, pigs, bars, blooms, slabs, ingots, sheets, plates, and rods, should be freed from taxation. In textiles, all wool, cotton, silk, flax, hemp, and jute, and the yarns and threads of every fibre should be admitted free. All machinery oils and dyes, and everything that increases the cost of the finished articles, and especially of those we export, should be untaxed, in order that we may produce our manufactures at the lowest cost, and be able to undersell all rivals in all markets. It is the tax on the materials of manufacture alone that keeps us out of foreign markets, and keeps our labor out of employment. A few years ago I was shown the bill of chemicals bought by one of the largest New England factories for one year. It amounted to over three hundred thousand dollars, and it embraced nearly all the chemicals in our tariff schedule. I discovered, in going through the mill, that a large number of machines were used that were imported. They cost from eight hundred to a thousand dollars each. The duty on them was forty-five per cent., and each had to be replaced by a new one in a few years. All this additional cost is summed up in every yard of cloth produced. When we reflect that the difference in the cost of production of a yard of cotton goods between the mills of the United States and those of Europe is a fraction of a cent, we see how inviting is the contest, and how easy is the victory if we will but cast off the weights and enter the lists.

England is manufacturing and shipping abroad annually more than three hundred million dollars' worth of cotton goods. It is in our power to take from her the greater part of this trade. To produce these goods would give constant and remunerative employment to more than one hundred and fifty thousand persons. The existing tariff shuts, bolts, and bars the door to that employment and protects the English laborer in enjoying the benefits of that trade. English manufacturers and English statesmen have for years seen with anxiety the slender hold they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have upon their foreign trade. They have watched with the utmost concern the growth of our manufacturing system and the superior capacity of our labor. They realize that they hold the world's markets by reason of our tariff on raw materials, which increases the cost of our goods so high that we cannot compete with them. They saw with alarm the triumph of Mr. Cleveland as the representative of commercial expansion. They knew that he was in favor of a reform that did reform, and they are eagerly watching every movement we make toward untaxing all raw materials. They would hail with delight a reduction of duty on their manufactures, which would help the trade of both countries. But they would regard as a calamity to them the untaxing of the materials of manufacture. The policy adopted by the committee, as shown by their bill, would lighten the burdens of taxation, increase our exports, and palliate to a considerable extent the evils of the present depression. But that falls short of the mark at which we should aim. The employment of *all* our labor, at *all* times, with a steady demand for it, is the condition which the interests of the country require us to establish and maintain. It was for that purpose the administration of government was placed in our hands. Invested with full power, the people expect us to emancipate them from the tyranny to which they have been so long enslaved. We have put our hands to the plough, and should not look back. We have started out from Sodom, and should "remember Lot's wife." There should be no halting, doubting, or debating as we stand on the banks of the stream. We must leave the dominion of the taskmasters, if we would be free and prosperous and happy. With our superiority in machinery, in the skill of our labor, and our proximity to the materials of manufacture, we have the easy advantage of all rivals. But it may be asked, How are we to get the $150,000,000 required from customs if these articles are freed from duties? The question presents no difficulties. I would tax articles that are now on the free list and that are not materials of manufacture. The tax on coffee, tea, and sugar will more than compensate for the tax released on the materials of manufacture. I have gone carefully over the list of imported articles for last year, and it is not a difficult work to select $500,000,000 of imports without embracing any materials of manufacture as I have indicated;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and upon these I would place a uniform duty of thirty per cent., which would give $150,000,000. These figures are based upon the imports of 1893, but the lowering of the rates of duty to thirty per cent. would greatly increase the imports, and the rate could be lowered at a subsequent Congress. It is not resources we want, but nerve with some, and more democracy with others.

The bill of Mr. Wilson, like the one of 1888, has only gone a Sabbath day's journey on the line of march. In both cases there is a long distance between what they are and what they ought to be, and the intervening space is filled up by insurmountable obstacles. This bill should be amended in some particulars and then passed, and the country will see and feel the benefits of larger and freer trade, and better employment and more earnings for its labor, and then it will advance with a bolder and longer step. The sugar bounty should be stricken from it. *Ad-valorem* should be substituted for specific duties wherever they occur, except on articles bearing internal taxes. With these and some minor changes the bill should be passed by the House at the earliest possible day. Before it reaches the Senate, the rules of that body should be changed, so that, after fair debate and full opportunity for amendment, it can be passed and sent to the President in the early spring. When that is done, the country will again spring forward and enter upon a career of prosperity; and the measure of its prosperity in the future will be marked by the extent to which its trade shall be liberated and its labor employed.

ROGER Q. MILLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE SENSES IN THE LOWER ANIMALS.

THE five senses of man—sight, hearing, touch, smell, and taste—are possessed by some of the very lowest creatures in the animal kingdom. This fact has been clearly demonstrated by Hessen, Lubbock, Wolfe, and many others. In the earthworm, one of the lowest forms in the scale of animal life, we first find the primitive eye. Careful inspection shows us on the body of the worm certain circumscribed spots, darker than the surrounding skin. These spots have been overlooked by other workers in this field, and, have not been recognized as eyes. Darwin, while recognizing the fact that worms are sensible to light, declares that they are blind. These ocelli, or primitive eyes, are found on the dorsal surface of the common earthworm. A microscopic examination shows that the spots consist of, first, a transparent membrane; second, an accumulation of pigmentary matter, and, third, a special nerve spread out in the pigmentary matter and going thence to the central nerve structure. These ocelli are exceedingly minute, being only one twenty-five hundredth of an inch in diameter. I believe that the transparent membrane is a true cornea, the pigmentary matter a true retina, and the special nerve a true optic nerve. There is no lens, consequently the worm is only able to distinguish between light and darkness. It is an eye nevertheless, and the worm is not blind. The worm is a nocturnal animal, consequently experiments with artificial lights can easily be made. They will continue feeding as long as the light is dim, but immediately withdraw into their burrows when subjected to the bright rays emanating from a large Argand burner. Experiments prove that it is the bright rays which affect them. They do not regard the dark or heat rays unless these rays are focussed on them. The sense of touch is distributed over the surface of the worm, and the arrangement of the terminal filaments does not differ very materially from that in man. They are, strictly speaking, devoid of the sense of hearing. Sound waves, however, are transmitted to the sensorium through an analogous sense—that of touch. Worms possess the special senses of taste and smell. This is shown by their selecting certain kinds of favorite foods in preference to others not so much relished, and by their hasty withdrawal into their burrows when an objectionable scent is sprinkled near them. Thus, when cabbage and fennel are mixed and strewn near the orifices of their burrows, they will select the cabbage. They will devour the fennel greedily, if it alone is given them. The odor of musk is particularly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

objectionable to worms. It is amusing to see the rapidity with which they seek their burrows when a drop of this substance is placed in the vessel containing them. Rose, lily, verbena, and heliotrope odors do not affect them. Violet scent makes them slightly uneasy, causing them to move their bodies slowly from side to side. They probably derive pleasure from this scent. The nerves of taste and smell are blended together, and can be readily made out with the microscope in the lips, so to speak, of the oral pouch.

The eyes of ants are of two kinds, compound and simple. The compound eye, so-called from the fact that eight or many more facets go to make up a single eye, are two in number, one on each side of the head. The ocelli or simple eyes are on top of the head. The visual picture, made by the compound eye, is a mosaic of the object viewed; each individual facet making a portion of the whole. All the ants I ever examined microscopically had ocelli, except one specimen of *Formica fusca*. Some writers claim that these ocelli are not sight-organs; that they are not functional but merely ornamental. Careful microscopic examination, however, proves them to be true organs of sight. There is a transparent membrane, the cornea; the pigmentary accumulation, the retina; and the special nerve, the optic nerve in each of these ocelli. These ocelli have gone a step higher than those found in the earthworm, in evolutionary development. They have a central chamber filled with fluid, which is analogous to the anterior chamber and aqueous humor of our eyes. These ocelli, therefore, have the power of not only distinguishing the light, but can even form an image on the retina. The range of vision in an ant does not exceed twelve inches in the compound eyes. In the ocelli it is very much less; probably not over two inches. The sense of taste is located, in ants, in the tongue and jaws. I fed some ants with a few grains of white sugar. They ate it greedily. I then substituted some boracic acid. They stopped feeding at once after the first bite, and immediately proceeded to get rid of the objectionable tasting substance. Experiments and microscopic examination, show that their sense of smell is located in their antennæ. Their organs of hearing are located in their legs. If we examine the tibia of an ant we will find a curious enlargement of the trachea. In the femur the diameter of the canal is one three-thousandths of an inch, but when it enters the tibia, it swells to a diameter of one five-hundredths of an inch, then contracts to one seven-hundredths, and then again at the end of the tibia expands to one five-hundredths of an inch. At the upper sac, where it contracts, there is a conical striated organ which, in my opinion, bears a striking resemblance to the plates of Corti in our own ears. This organ has a special nerve, the auditory nerve. Ants can undoubtedly communicate with one another. Most authorities agree in saying that they communicate through their antennæ. They may communicate through sounds so low or so high that our ears, notwithstanding our four thousand plates of Corti, cannot perceive them, Microscopically, I can find no vocal organs or instruments of stridulation, such as we find in *Gryllus*. The lowest sound we can hear is probably about twelve vibrations to the second, while the highest is some thirty-five thousand vibrations Some men can distinguish sounds that cannot be noticed by other men. A music teacher gives me an instance of the fact in one of his pupils. When the piccolo stop is drawn, this pupil cannot hear the last note (A'') in upper register of the organ. The plate of the Corti that vibrates in unison with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this particular tone is absent in his ears. I have repeatedly noticed intelligent communication between ants. One day, while watching a herd of aphides and their attendant guards, I suddenly saw an army of *Lasius niger* approaching. They were marching in full battle array, with a skirmish line in advance. They came on with a rush, as if they intended a surprise. Some outposts, or pickets, of *Lasius flavus* discovered them when ten or twelve feet away from the town of *Lasivs flavus*. These pickets raced home and gave the alarm. Immediately the inhabitants poured out and arranged themselves in front of their beloved herd. Skirmishers were thrown out and soon met the advancing *Lasius niger*. In a few moments the battle was on, and it was a battle to the death. The *Lasius niger* outnumbered the *Lasius flavus* three to one. As near as I could reckon there were about 1,500 of the blacks and about 500 of the yellow ants. The yellow ants were larger and stronger, but the blacks were more agile. The yellow *Lasius* rushed at her enemy with open mandibles, and seizing her by the middle, crushed her through and through. The black *Lasius* endeavored to get behind her enemy and then seize her by one of her legs. If she succeeded in her attempt, no bull dog ever held on with greater tenacity. As soon as possible another black ant would come to her assistance, and mounting on the back of the yellow ant would begin at once to gnaw through the thoracic wall. In a few seconds the shell would be eaten through, the vitals would be reached, and the yellow ant would sink down in the struggle of death. Not until certain that she was dead would *Lasius niger*, who had her by the leg, loosen her hold. *Lasius niger*, in this foray, came in light marching order. They carried no commissariat department, no ambulance corps. *Lasius flavus*, on the contrary, had both. When wearied or wounded the yellow ants would drop to the rear and communicate their wants. The ambulance corps dressed their wounds with their tongues; the commissariat refreshed them by regurgitating food into their open jaws. All through the battle I noticed this wonderful power of intelligent communication. *Lasius flavus* sent repeatedly back to the town to bring out the stragglers. It was like a well-ordered battle between human beings. These ants acted as though governed by an intelligence analogous to that which directs the actions of man. In the end *Lasius niger* won the victory, but not until they had killed every *Lasius flavus*, and lost two-thirds of their own number. The survivors carried off the bone of contention, the herd of aphides, to their own nest, some fifty feet away.

JAMES WEIR, JR.

COLORADO'S BRIGHT OUTLOOK.

THE statement of Governor Waite in the January REVIEW that "the annual production of 27,000,000 ounces of silver cut off by the closing of the mines has deprived Colorado of about $24,000,000 per annum" is one which will not bear examination. The official figures just published in the annual reviews of the Denver papers show that in 1893 the silver product of the State was 23,017,089 ounces, against 26,542,135 ounces in 1892. The product for the past year sold for $17,797,890. The slight loss in quantity was unnecessary and was wholly caused by the needless shutting down of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certain rich mines for three or four months. The loss in value was only about 17 per cent. as compared with the prices obtained the previous year. Even this was a relative and not an actual loss, because the shrinkage in the average of all commodities which are purchased by the sale of silver has been fully as much, if not more, and the cost of labor in the mines has been reduced almost precisely as much as silver has fallen. At this moment all the smelters worth mentioning have resumed, and nearly all the silver mines which have pay ore are producing. It it certain that the output for the coming year will be within a few millions, more or less, of the previous average.

Intelligent Colorado business men believe that silver mining is not only as permanent an industry as iron or coal mining, but they are now convinced that the purchasing power of an ounce of silver bullion is more permanent than that of the unit of any other commodity produced in the world. It will purchase about as much of the staple commodities like wheat, cotton, and iron now at 68 cents as it would purchase before demonetization at 129 cents, at par with gold. By this tremendously important fact we prove that the purchasing power of gold has doubled during the life of any debt that is twenty years old, and that the "honest" lender receives, besides his interest, twice as much as he loaned to the "dishonest" borrower. To the objection that this cannot be so, because labor has not fallen, we reply that its decline has been offset by modern inventions which increase the value of its product.

While we all angrily opposed the silver repeal, we are rapidly coming to the conclusion that it is to prove a blessing in disguise. It has not permanently hurt silver, while it has already revived our comparatively dormant gold-mining industry to the very verge of a boom. In this time of great stagnation, and in the dead of winter, two rival railroads are actually running a construction race through the mountain cañons to the newly discovered gold mines of Cripple Creek, where, besides many rich veins, actual mountains of low-grade gold ore containing not less than a hundred millions practically in sight only await cheap transportation and cheap milling processes to be ground up. One tunnel is started to cut the old and deep gold veins near Central half a mile below the surface, which will be four miles long and take four years to finish. The established veins which it will make profitable again are estimated to contain 200,000,000 of gold. The great gold belt of Colorado, reaching from Long's Peak to beyond the southwest corner of the State, is over 200 miles long by eighty miles wide. All over it, every ten or twenty miles, gold has been found generally in low-grade ore. There are in the State, perhaps five thousand opened veins in old or abandoned camps which were discovered years ago, but which it did not until recently pay to work. While improved transportation and improved mining machinery have probably reduced the cost of mining one-half, the triumph of the gold standard has apparently doubled the value of the gold, and all the mines are starting up. A mine with vast deposits of low-grade ore worth $18 a ton had to stop because the cost of production was $20. But now, when production costs only $10, and the purchasing power of $18 is raised to $36, the profit in resuming is very clear. It is not extravagant to say that there are in Colorado a thousand millions of gold in the low-grade ore in sight, most of which will pay for working under existing conditions. The new gold mining revival is less than four months old, and yet it increased the old average gold product of less than $5,000,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per annum to $7,802,453 for 1893. Experts estimate the gold output for the incoming year at $20,000,000.

It is a nut for both free traders and protectionists to crack that Colorado manufacturing industries are all prosperous and running full force and time, whereas there seems to be everywhere else a partial shutdown. Aside from the $43,336,385 worth of precious metal ores, one-third of which was from other States, which our smelters handled in 1893, and which was an increase over any previous year, the manufactories proper of Denver alone produced $20,000,000 of goods which found a market all the way to the Pacific. Among the newer products of these factories are paper, cotton goods, shoes, and woollens. The Pueblo steel-rail mills, employing 2,000 men, are just resuming. No fear of tariff reduction checks these industries. This is a point for free-traders. But the long-rail haul from the East is an actual protective tariff which will remain whatever Congress does. Here is an illustration of flourishing industries directly fostered by the operation of the protective principle. Our agricultural and live stock products for the year just closed are returned at $56,900,000. Of lead we produced $3,811,223. We supply the vast region between the Missouri and the Pacific with its petroleum. Our State produced 4,200,000 tons of coal in 1893, against 375,000 tons in 1880. This rapidly increasing product will soon be worth more than our silver. Indeed, its retail price amounts to more now. It is both bituminous and anthracite, and is sold all the way from Omaha to Los Angeles. We have endless quantities of it, as well as of iron. Of many minor items I will add only one. The colony of farmers which Horace Greeley founded in Colorado in 1870, and which is named after him, receives a million dollars a year for its fine potatoes, which are distributed from San Francisco to Chicago and New Orleans, and are so famous that they have immortalized the philosopher who advised their producers to go west.

Half the decline in Denver bank clearings is due to the fall of prices rather than to the reduction of business, and the other half to a stampede of customers from the banks which temporarily suspended last summer to the few that stood the storm. Denver real estate, which shows symptoms of revived activity, carries large mortgage indebtedness, next in *per-capita* size to Chicago, but it is mostly due to home building associations. It is a significant fact that the Rio Grande Railroad, which threads the mountain mining camps for more than 1,400 miles, weathered the storm without falling into a receiver's hands. Nearly all our idle workingmen are now employed again, and if several thousand had not recently come from the East we could boast that no man in the State lacks work. Colorado is the most loyal, debt-paying community in the world. She has the most barbarous attachment laws and a cruel trust-deed, cut-throat-foreclosure act upon her statute-books expressly to please Eastern capital. Even the present legislature, which is Republican in both branches, repealed the very moderate railroad law we had over Governor Waite's veto. Such a body will pass no law impairing the obligation of contracts. Public sentiment here is as strong against anything of that kind as it is in Boston. The only real misfortune which the State labors under just now is the widespread depression in the East. From that region our dependent capital must largely come. Eastern people, seeing stagnation all around them, cannot understand how prosperity can exist in a State which but a few months ago was supposed to be so prostrate that it was an object of pity.

JOHN E. LEET.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BANE OF FRIENDLY RECEIVERSHIPS.

THE judiciary of this country seems to be under the hypnotic charm of the officers of corporations. The facility with which corporation managers, when their individual interests require it, are permitted to precipitate their corporation into a receivership, and have themselves or some "man" whom they can control appointed, leads one to conclude that some judges must believe that the object of the laws creating corporations is to provide "soft places" for certain gentlemen, as officers, while the corporation lives, and, as receivers, after its death.

There is a great outcry among the masses against corporations. Some people, of radically socialistic tendencies, even desire the abolition of all corporate franchises. This, of course, is absurd. However, the abuses which have grown up are such as to imperil the existence of the laws under which corporations are created. When men, who have been swindled in their dealings with corporations, see the very men who have despoiled them appointed receivers, they, almost involuntarily, begin an indiscriminate crusade against corporations; those that are honestly as well as those that are dishonestly managed, coming within the sweep of their condemnation. The most vicious abuse that has grown up with reference to corporations is "friendly receiverships." The law requires most substantial and urgent grounds for the appointment of a receiver. There is, however, a fascination about the exercise of power; and, on this theory only, can one understand on what meagre and flimsy grounds receivers are appointed. A corporation, through its counsel, recently applied to one of our great judges for a receiver, a "friendly" creditor being the nominal plaintiff. The application showed that the creditor could easily have satisfied his demand out of available assets, if he had so desired. The judge read the application and said indignantly: "This man comes into court and simply asks me to put handcuffs on him. I won't do it." But another judge did.

Many corporations that fail never had the capital that was claimed for them. A collapse comes, and then the men who have brought it about may seek the friendly shelter of a receivership, through which they can remain masters of the situation and practically prevent an investigation by retaining control of its books and papers. In many cases they ought to be sued, for the difference between the actual and the claimed value of what they put in to pay their stock, but who is to bring the suits? The receivers, who in such cases would be both plaintiffs and defendants!

Business failures more often result from poor management than accident, and, in the case of corporations, more frequently from reckless than weak management. Many corporations are wrecked by officers using the corporate funds as if they belonged to them. These wreckers, however, have little difficulty in getting a clean bill of health from the courts in their appointment as receivers. If a corporation manager is so unskilled or reckless that he is unable to keep it going, how can it be that he possesses sufficient ability or stability to operate it successfully as a receiver? Has an order of court the magic power to transform him into a man of business talent and genius? But, you might say, he acts under orders of court. Every one familiar with these matters knows that almost invariably the orders made are such as the receiver, who is supposed to possess the confidence of the court, applies for.

A railroad president, whose wild recklessness was largely responsible

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the deplorable condition of his corporation, experienced no difficulty recently in having himself appointed receiver, and this appointment stood until public opinion forced his retirement. Men float debentures on the theory that they are backed by first mortgages, when, instead, the collateral "securing" them consists of second mortgages or other questionable assets, and yet this seems no obstacle to their appointment as receivers.

Corporation officers often say, "We went into the hands of a receiver because we wanted a little breathing time." The law gives creditors the right to enforce their demands, when due, the same against a corporation as against an individual, and yet the courts appoint receivers for corporations on the flimsiest grounds, and permit them to carry on their business without interruption, but prevents the creditors doing anything, except to sit by and see the managers operate them as they deem proper. The larger number of receiverships are simply placing the strong arm of the court between the officers and the stockholders and creditors. If the officers knew in advance that when their companies failed they would lose control, they would be much more conservative. When they know they will have to seek new positions, they will be less apt to study how to "freeze out" by a receivership the rank and file of the stockholders and creditors. We would then have less "reorganization" schemes, which practically take the small holders by the throat and force them to accept the terms offered.

Courts in appointing receivers should "represent" those who are not present in court, and should appoint men who will guard the rights of all alike. Our corporation laws generally require radical overhauling. When anything besides money constitutes the capital, it should be put in at real value, to be ascertained by responsible public officers, and a statement should be filed, so the public can see what is put in, and at what price. Corporations should be examined at frequent intervals by competent officers, and when the capital is impaired a reduction should be advised, unless the impairment is promptly made good. The law should most rigidly prescribe the duties and define the liabilities of directors. Directors who are there simply for "show" should be weeded out. Insolvent corporations should not be permitted to make preferences. Their property is a trust fund, and should be administered for all creditors alike. And finally, when a corporation through insolvency is unable to continue, some disinterested man should be placed in charge by the courts, or, better still, by some department of the State government having supervision of all corporations.

When the officers of a corporation acknowledge their inability to successfully manage its affairs, by asking for a receiver, they should step down, and give way to some impartial, capable man who has no past to cover up and no selfish schemes to foster. The legislative enactments that breathe life into corporations should place the amplest safeguards around them for the protection of those who are to deal with them. The law should assume such supervision over them as will insure their honest management; and when they can no longer continue without serious peril to the stockholders and creditors, the State should see that their affairs are speedily, honestly, and economically wound up. HENRY WOLLMAN.

PARIS WORKINGMEN'S CAFÉS.

THE workingmen's cafés of Paris, as a class, may best be described by telling of a single evening in one of them. At eight o'clock the café

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is already nearly full. As you pass the desk of the proprietor, he vouchsafes a nod, a smile and a pleasant word that put you at home at once. You are a guest, not a customer; so are all who enter.

Taking one of the few vacant seats in the back room, you give your order to a bright-eyed, quick-moving *garçon* for a *café cognac*, listed at twenty *centimes* (four cents) and guaranteed *sans rival*. The furnishings are not in the best of taste; they are chiefly glitter and gaud. Nevertheless the room is a beautiful sight; it is so full of the brighter aspects of humanity. Here are bloused and frocked laborers, with their white-capped wives and their black-aproned children; petty tradesmen and tradeswomen, and one or two uniformed soldiers. On the tables are glasses of dark-brown coffee, light-brown beer, red wine and pearly absinthe, beside cards, dice, dominoes, checker and back-gammon boards, tally slates and newspapers. Here also are tobacco smoke and good humor, and emulation and curiosity and labyrinthine chatter, but no drunkenness or rudeness or tobacco juice or saturated sawdust.

Across the table from you, sipping absinthe between the puffs of a cigarette he has just rolled, is a plump, old fellow, whose blue overalls and flannel shirt, under a cotton-velvet coat, are tell-tale of a menial employment. In spite of his costume, he is plainly a dreamer of such dreams as those with which Tartarin of Tarascon was wont to beguile his own credulity, and (in the utterance) that of his friends. A red rose in his button-hole indicates that his dreams sometimes promenade in the *beau monde* where his overalls dare not venture, and a red fez, only a trifle more red than the face it surmounts, hints that they sometimes stray to Africa to "hunt the lion." After a deal of mysterious whispering, two boys at another table get pen, ink and paper from the *garçon* and indite a joint epistle. A neglected looking old man near them takes a small loaf of bread from one pocket and a slice of sausage from another, and then, with the help of half a bottle of wine, makes his evening repast, thus happily escaping the dreadful sensation of preparing a solitary meal in a cheerless room. In a distant corner a dark-skinned, flashing-eyed beauty of not more than eighteen is engaged in an exciting game of dominoes with an elderly woman, evidently her mother. The mother was a beauty also before the wrinkles and disfiguring moustache came. Other women are sewing and chatting busily. A decayed *boulevardier* gossips from table to table. Whether decay is pathetic or diverting depends upon circumstances. The *boulevardier*, at his best, being but a pretty piece of pettiness, is merely grotesque when he decays. This particular specimen lost caste among his fellow *boulevardiers* long ago, and has since been engaged in trying to attract a court of admirers in the lower kingdom of the befrocked. The befrocked, however, pay no attention to his airiness. Their good sense is not to be dazzled by a piece of worthless bric-à-brac.

One does not look to find bibliophiles in a workingman's café, yet here are three touching heads over a tiny, parchment-covered book that one of them has just drawn from an inside pocket. It is a poem in several cantos—an antique treasure as yellow within and without as the chartreuse in its owner's glass. About nine o'clock a professional fire-swallower gives a startling exhibition of his skill for the sous he can collect. At ten o'clock the patrons begin to leave, and by eleven, despite the notoriously late hours kept in Paris, the room is practically empty.

What of the influence of the workingman's café? Does it not encourage

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drinking and libertinism? Is it not a waster of time and money? Does it not destroy home life? There is just enough truth in the ideas from which these queries proceed to justify the putting of the queries—no more. That it encourages the drinking habit is true only in the sense that in a community where everybody drinks as a matter of course, the café is a pleasant place to drink, because there one drinks with one's friends. The café does not encourage intemperance. That is one of the many differences between it and the American saloon. Black coffee, though by no means the only one, is still the most popular drink, and it is the exception for a second order to be given. The glasses are always on the tables and there is always something in them, and everybody seems always to be drinking, and the *garçon* seems always alert, and the wonder of it is that the glasses are never refilled. Drinking of this sort is a veritable fine art. In fact for over a hundred years it has been the right of every café patron, at the price of a single drink, to be provided with light and heat (both dear in Paris), newspapers, games, writing materials and sedulous attendance for an almost unlimited number of hours.

If people were something other than they are, time and money would perhaps be better spent than they are now in the café. With the ten cents per night or less the Frenchman pays there, he might buy paper editions of the French classics; but we know very well that he would not. He might spend his evenings reading these classics aloud to his family; but we know just as well that he would not do that either. The café is merely guilty of making the idleness of out-of-work hours a bright and pleasant thing. Everybody knows that there are drinking resorts in Paris whose prime object is the encouragement of immorality, but it is a mistake to confound these with the workingmen's cafés. The latter are no more open to the charge than all social gatherings for both sexes. The girls who are permitted to visit the workingmen's cafés are almost invariably attended and carefully watched by their elders.

Because Paris has workingmen's cafés, workingmen and their families have ready at hand plenty of the innocent, economical enjoyment which philanthropic London is trying to provide its East End, through the People's Palace and similar agencies, and which public-spirited citizens are trying (without much permanent success) to devise in all the great cities of this country. Better still, Paris working people have, besides the family resorts, the inherent habit of frequenting the resorts they have. In providing this innocent amusement the café exerts a great conserving force. But the café is more than a conservator; it is an educator. It keeps its patrons intellectually alert by putting them in touch with the movements of the times, especially the political movements. Various journals are read aloud, and their reading is illuminated by subsequent discussion. This exchange of views soon makes accomplished conversationalists.

The constant social intercourse afforded by the café has marvellously developed the French social instinct—naturally strong, Continual contact with other people keeps a Parisian continually reminded of the existence of other people, and the reminder prompts to a recognition of social rights. In other words the café develops the courtesies of life—makes its patrons, though they be working people, true ladies and gentlemen. The café is to a degree the French neighborhood tea, church social, sewing circle, lyceum, current items club, reading club, social club and corner grocery, having some of the elements of all and all of none. And the work-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing people of Paris have it very much to thank for their exceptional good breeding, light-heartedness, vivacity and intelligence.

ALVAN F. SANBORN.

THE AMATEUR NURSE—AN ACCOMPLISHED FACT.

IF AT times the world seems small, so intimately acquainted is one person with another, there are also times when our next-door neighbor is unaware of our deeds. Surely no one could have written more forcibly of the need of "amateur nurses" than has C. H. Crandall, in the December number of The REVIEW. Never has the philanthropic and domestic argument for the education of just such women been more eloquently and carefully stated. Yet apparently the author is unaware that instruction similar to that he proposes is given in several cities, chiefly in Brooklyn, New York, and Boston. The credit of originating and successfully training "convalescent nurses" belongs to Mrs. Charles N. Judson, President of the Brooklyn Young Women's Christian Association; and to Miss Katherine N. Adams, of the Red Cross Society, for three or four years voluntarily giving her services as teacher. A little more than a year ago, through the efforts of Miss A. C. Howes, a similar plan was tried in Boston, under the auspices of the Massachusetts Emergency and Hygiene Association. It was important to distinguish clearly between the instruction of the "attendants" (the Boston term) and the services rendered by them, and the education of trained nurses and their subsequent duties. At the same time it was expedient to have the "attendants" recognized by legitimate medical authority as a class of women competent for certain work. This recognition was obtained through the Committee of the Medical Library Association, under the charge of the Massachusetts Medical Society, which granted permission to pupils, on passing their examination, to register at the Directory. Mrs. Dita H. Kinney, a lady specially fitted for the position and a graduate of the Training School for Nurses at the Massachusetts General Hospital, was engaged as teacher. The instruction is specific and limited to the duties of an attendant in care of the sickroom; taking temperature and pulse of a patient; preparation of poultices, baths, food; ventilation and use of disinfectants. A certain amount of physiology is also taught, pupils occasionally visiting the hospital with Mrs. Kinney. The examinations are conducted by some member of the medical society. No pupil is allowed to charge more than $7.00 a week during the first year of service, her certificate stating that she is only qualified to take care of convalescents, chronic invalids, feeble elderly persons, and little children. The advantages arising from these methods are threefold: (1) That a new avenue for self-support is opened to women. (2) That there is no possibility of confusion between the domain of the trained, skilful nurse with her two years of close application as student (which renders her able to cope with emergencies or wasting disease), and the limited knowledge and general duties of an "attendant." (3) Lastly, perhaps chiefly, tired or overbusy mothers, patient invalids, people with small means, are now able to procure in their nurseries and homes the services of intelligent, agreeable women, with whom children can be trusted, and who will tenderly watch over the convalescent and the aged.

The element of being personally agreeable through physical and mental

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

refinement is of greater importance in the tedious care of convalescents and children, who must be amused, read to, watched, and tended, than in the active fight with sickness when more valuable qualities of mind and body are requisite. Servants, even nursemaids, as a rule, know little of what to do in sickness, though they too often think they know, and mothers and housekeepers have such a multiplicity of things to do, that these attendants can do much to lessen the fatigue and anxiety of others. It is not only self-supporting women, but educated women, so to speak who need special instruction in the care of the sickroom, though it should, never be forgotten that to the physician belong authority and responsibility, and that to him implicit obedience is due. But as any woman at any time is liable to be called upon to assist in the care of the sick, and as the utter ignorance from which most of us suffer makes others than ourselves wretched, many "educated" women take the same training as an "attendant."

Talks on home nursing are also given at working-girls' clubs by lady doctors and by lay ladies, the latter of whom have gone through a certain course of limited instruction and been examined as to their competency and thoroughness by physicians. The girls are systematically taught the preparation of poultices, bedmaking, changing sheets, etc., the best way of washing and dressing a baby as shown by means of a huge rubber doll, the home process of sterilizing milk, etc. All this is not merely talked about, but actually done before the girls, who, in turn, are themselves obliged to do these things over and over before the class. Even if they learn their lesson well, they are repeatedly told that their only safety in sickness lies in following the physician's directions. It should never be forgotten that these "talks" should be purely objective. Nothing which in any way belongs to the province of the physician should be touched upon. Whenever doctors feel assured that such care is exercised, they are hearty in their approval of enlarging the boundaries of common-sense. But when they see rules and regulations prescribed by people who do not know what they are talking about, they do well to withhold their approval from such forms of philanthropy. Yet surely by the application of common-sense, which is neither a patent nor a quack medicine, the poor sick can render themselves and their families more comfortable. Those who are able to lighten their cares by procuring the aid of "attendants" will preserve their own health, while to the trained nurse and the good physician we owe our success in the struggles between life and death, in which we so often are enlisted for ourselves or others.

KATE GANNETT WELLS.

CUBAN WOMEN.

A TYPICAL Cuban beauty—and Cuba is famed for its beautiful women—has large, languishing, black eyes, with long eyelashes, a small mouth, red lips, a colorless complexion—in the tropics red cheeks and a bright blooming complexion are seldom seen—and skin with the opaque whiteness of a camellia. She is of medium height, has a shapely form, graceful undulating gait, and her hands and feet are small, and exquisitely shaped. She is generally languid and listless, but she has a winning way and charming manners, with plenty of mother-wit to supply the lack of book-learning, because after leaving school Cuban girls usually relegate their books to oblivion, and only occupy their minds with the chit-chat of society, dress, fashion, or household matters. Nevertheless many are educated at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the best convents and schools in Paris or New York or in other large cities, where they acquire a brilliant education which fits them to hold their own in society. But after they return to the tropics, they learn that the climate is not conducive to mental labor, but rather to a life of *dolce far niente*.

A Cuban girl's life is very restricted, and she is never allowed to go out alone, nor receive callers of the other sex except in the presence of her chaperone or some member of her family. If during her childhood she attends a day-school, a maid or some family servant takes her there every day. And she cannot go as short a distance as across the street unaccompanied. In some instances Spanish customs are absurd and incongruous. Every well-fitted establishment in Cuba is provided with a *concierge* to guard the entrance and admit callers. This man, usually an ignorant peasant, sometimes escorts the young ladies of the family he is serving, and that is considered perfectly proper; whereas it would not be proper for them to go out attended by a gentleman, even if he were old enough to be their father and an old friend of the family as well. Of late years, however, the frequent intercourse between Cuba and the United States has somewhat modified the customs. For instance, two ladies can now go out alone in Havana in the day-time, which would have been considerd an unheard-of and most shocking proceeding a few years ago. The social pastimes a girl enjoys in Cuba consist of balls, parties, concerts, receptions, the theatre and opera, and picnics—for the Cubans have adopted this American diversion, although in a modified form to suit the requirements of Cuban etiquette.

Cuban girls usually marry very young, even at twelve and thirteen years of age; although nowadays such marriages are not usually deemed advisable nor countenanced by their parents, as that is too early for a girl to assume the cares and responsibilities of married life and maternity. Except in ultra-fashionable circles in Havana, which follow French customs and adopt French views of life, after a girl marries she does not care much for society, and devotes her time exclusively to her husband and her children. In their home life Cuban women are devoted to their children, being too indulgent and self-sacrificing sometimes. A woman's whole life is given up to her husband and her family, and she considers no sacrifice too great to make for them. In her social relations she is a warm, constant friend, and in time of trouble faithful and kind.

Perhaps some of the customs which cause a Spaniard or Cuban to guard the women of his household so jealously may be due in a measure to the influence of the Moors in Spain during olden times, and they may have adopted their ideas in regard to woman, considering her as a beautiful, charming being, made to delight a man's heart and grace his home, and be the guardian of domestic peace and joy, but to exist for him alone, without any aspirations beyond her household, nor desire to mingle with the world. Women, however, are gradually becoming emancipated from this social thraldom, and men look on them more as equals, or companions, than simply as beautiful creatures to be worshipped and treated with chivalrous regard, but to be kept excluded from the world or subservient to men's will; and we now read of women being admitted to the bar and allowed to practise medicine and other professions in Spain as well as in Spanish-American countries. But Spaniards will be the very last people in the world to approve of these "new-fangled notions."

MARY ELIZABETH SPRINGER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED